The KING IN EXILE

THE WANDERINGS OF CHARLES II.

EVA SCOTT

061
3.50 net

ndo

AS. E. LAURIAT CO.
ORTERS & BOOKSELLERS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/kinginexile0000evas_h4e2

Sophia, Princess Palatine,

(Electress of Hanover.)

From the picture in the National Portrait Gallery, London, after Honthorst.

Photograph by Walker & Cockerell.

THE KING IN EXILE

The Wanderings of Charles II. from June 1646 to July 1654

BY

EVA SCOTT

AUTHOR OF
'RUPERT, PRINCE PALATINE'

ILLUSTRATED

DA
446
S42

NEW YORK
E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY
1905

222055

'And though there were no trouble beneath the sun but a man to be far from his own land, there is little delight in peace and a long sleep to a man that is an exile. It is a pity for the man that is an exile; it is little his honour, it is great his grief, for it is he will have his share of wandering.'

Cuchulain of Muirthemne.
(Translated by Lady Gregory.)

PREFACE

THE exile of Charles II. dates from the 26th of June 1646, on which, as Prince of Wales, he sailed for France from Jersey, to the 20th of May 1660, when he landed at Dover, England's accepted King.

In the preface to his *Charles II.*, recently issued in a cheap edition, Mr. Airy has pointed out the importance of this period of the King's life. It was the period in which Charles's character, and, to some extent, the character of the England of the Restoration, was definitely formed. But, though Mr. Airy has devoted a fourth part of his interesting book to the history of these fourteen years, the limitations of space have compelled him to give it, more or less, in outline.

I have attempted to relate it in some detail, and since it is impossible to do this in a single volume, I have reserved the history of the latter years of exile for another instalment, and it is with the first eight years only that this book is concerned.

In the first days of his banishment Charles found a kindly welcome at the Court of his cousin, Louis XIV., and for two years he dwelt quietly at St. Germains, under the tutelage of his mother. So long as he was Prince of Wales he was little more than a tool in her hands, but

when the death of his father made him King in his nineteenth year, he at once proceeded to shake off the maternal yoke. From that time began the differences between himself and the Queen-Mother, which, widening gradually, brought them, and their respective Courts, at last, to open and scandalous hostility.

From that time too began the real trials and troubles of the exile. In the eleven years that followed, Charles and his adherents experienced strange vicissitudes, suffered continual humiliation, privation, and disappointment, and found themselves constantly tossed from hope to despair, and again from despair to the highest pinnacle of hope. Yet their hopefulness seldom failed them for any length of time, and they were rarely without sanguine anticipation of a speedy change of fortune founded on the divisions of their foes, the promises of their friends, or the expected interposition of some foreign power. From first to last they never lacked an intrigue in England, Scotland or Ireland, nor did Charles ever cease from strenuous effort to gain the active aid of the European powers.

To this he had such claim as kinship could give him. Louis XIV. of France was his mother's nephew and his own first cousin. Philip IV. of Spain was his uncle by marriage with Queen Henrietta's sister, Elisabeth of France. Christian IV. of Denmark was his great-uncle, and Fredrick III., who succeeded to the Danish throne in 1648, was his first cousin once removed. Finally, William II., Prince of Orange and Stadtholder of Holland since 1647, was the husband of Charles's eldest sister, Mary.

The claims of kinship were not wholly neglected, and

even the cautious Kings of Denmark supplied their destitute relatives with some small sums of money. William of Orange succoured them generously, as far as in him lay, and his death in November 1650 deprived Charles of the best friend he had on the Continent. France, notwithstanding her many troubles, external and internal, maintained the Queen and her youngest daughter for sixteen years, and would have extended the same hospitality to her two younger sons, James and Henry, had their elder brother permitted them to accept it. Charles himself enjoyed the protection of France, nominally at least, for eight years, and when that country was forced to make her peace with England, he sought, and found a similar protection and maintenance from Spain.

More than this he could not obtain. Europe was exhausted by the Thirty Years' War, and not one of the Powers was at that time in a condition to take upon itself new burdens and responsibilities. Thus it came to pass that the English Commonwealth, 19th May 1649-16th December 1653, and subsequently the Protectorate, 16th December 1653-7th May 1659, were suffered to establish themselves without opposition, and that the alliance with England was eagerly sought by nations who knew themselves unable to cope with a fresh foe.

The years with which we have here to deal are the most varied, and, on the whole, the most eventful of the first Stuart exile. They witnessed the Second Civil War, May-August 1648; the death of Charles I., 29th January 1649; the last struggle of Ormonde in Ireland, October 1648-December 1650; the last effort of Montrose in

the Scottish Highlands, May 1650; Charles's treaty with the Scottish Covenanters, March-May 1650; his expedition to Scotland, June 1650-July 1651; his march into England, August-September 1651; his defeat at Worcester, 3rd September 1651; and his subsequent adventurous flight through the western and southern counties, 3rd September-16th October 1651.

Contemporaneous with these events were the French wars of the Fronde, in which the Stuarts were not without a part, and the third outbreak of that war, November 1651-October 1652, followed close on Charles's return to Paris. Later came the last Royalist rising in Scotland, October 1652-July 1654, and at the same time abortive plots were formed in both England and Ireland.

These years were therefore years of hope, when Royalists still stood in arms in the three kingdoms, when the intervention of Europe was confidently expected, and when restoration seemed not only possible, but probable to the yearning exiles. But they were also years of hope deferred, years that saw the gradual sickening of the heart, the growth of divisions and dissensions in the Royalist ranks, the steady decay of morale among men capable of a splendid devotion, but not proof against all the misery it involved. And to many came the bitterest pang of all in the knowledge that these years had witnessed also the dishonour of their King.

Reference to the authorities consulted has been given in the footnotes, but a few words concerning the principal sources of information will not be out of place. These are the Clarendon and Carte collections of manuscripts in the Bodleian Library; the *Nicholas Papers*, preserved

among the Egerton Manuscripts in the British Museum; the Foreign Letters and Papers, and the *Domestic State Papers* in the Public Record Office, and the *Thurloe State Papers*, of which the originals are among the Rawlinson Manuscripts in the Bodleian.

The three first-named collections contain the papers and correspondence of Hyde, Ormonde, and Nicholas respectively. To these men, Charles's most trusted councillors, most of his affairs, public and private, were confided, and they have preserved, in addition to State documents and innumerable letters received, draughts of many letters written by the King and by themselves. Their correspondence is made especially interesting by the frankness with which they expressed their views on all subjects to one another.

The greater part of the *Nicholas Papers* has been published by the Camden Society, and many of Ormonde's letters are printed in Carte's *Original Letters*, and in the fifth and sixth volumes of his *Life of Ormonde*. The printed volumes of the Rev. W. D. Macray's ably edited *Calendar*, which forms so valuable a guide to the study of the Clarendon MSS., carry us to the close of the year 1657. Some of the foreign papers of the Record Office have been calendared among the *Domestic State Papers*. The *Thurloe Papers*, which contain the intelligence sent to the English Secretary of State by his spies both at home and abroad, are almost entirely in print.

The numerous contemporary relations of the King's adventures after Worcester have been printed and published in various forms, but they have been recently collected and edited by Mr. Allan Fea in his two volumes,

The Flight of the King, and *After Worcester Fight.* The story is of course well known, but the present work would have appeared incomplete without it, and I have therefore endeavoured to weave the various accounts of it into one consecutive narrative.

With regard to Montrose, Napier's *Memoirs* are exhaustive. The domestic history of England during this period is to be found in the late Mr. S. R. Gardiner's *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate.* Contemporary memoirs dealing with the history of France and the wars of the Fronde are many and various, but among the most useful are those of Madame de Motteville, Mademoiselle de Montpensier, and the Cardinal De Retz. To these the works of M. Chéruel and M. Cousins form a valuable supplement and commentary.

E. S.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

General Character of the Exile—Departure of the Prince of Wales from Jersey, ... 1

CHAPTER II

The Flight of the Queen—The State of France—Position of the Prince—Unpopularity of the Queen—Charles at the French Court—His Courtship of Mademoiselle—Anxiety of his Councillors, ... 17

CHAPTER III

Causes of the Second Civil War—Parties in Scotland—The Engagement—Projected Rising—Revolt of the Fleet—Escape of the Duke of York—James and the Fleet—Poverty of the Queen—Hyde called to Paris—The Prince goes to Holland—The Queen's Policy—The Prince and the Fleet—Failure of the English Rising—Defeat of the Scots, ... 38

CHAPTER IV

Charles in Holland—Divisions in the Council—Rupert and the Fleet—State of Ireland—Illness of Charles—Christmas at the Hague—Rumours of the King's Trial—Efforts of Charles to save him—Horror at the King's Death—The War of the Fronde—The Queen's Sufferings—James goes to Paris—Effect of the King's Death on the Queen, ... 63

CHAPTER V

PAGE

Effects of the King's Death—Overtures from Scotland—Charles invited to Ireland—Scottish Factions at the Hague—Montrose—The Engagers—Arrival of Argyle's Commissioners—Their favourable Opinion of Charles—The Princess Sophie—Murder of Dorislaus—Charles's Reply to the Scots—He accepts the Scheme of Montrose—Hyde and Cottington sent to Madrid, . 79

CHAPTER VI

Charles leaves Holland—Mademoiselle—Strained Relations of Charles and Henrietta—Influence of Elliot—Factions—Charles goes to Jersey, ... 102

CHAPTER VII

The Winter in Jersey—Preparations of Montrose—New Overtures from Scotland—Charles's Letters to Montrose—The Journey to Breda—Hopes from England—The Treaty of Breda—Royalist Dissensions—Advice of William II.—Defeat and Death of Montrose—Charles threatens to break the Treaty—Sails for Scotland—Makes last Concessions and takes the Covenant, ... 119

CHAPTER VIII

Charles's Arrival in Scotland—Dismissal of his Friends—Argyle's Policy—The King's Position—Alarm in England—Cromwell marches to Scotland—Plans of the English Royalists—Their Failure—Scottish Preparations—Anne Murray—The King and the Army—Purging—The New Declaration—Charles and the Dean of Tuam—The Battle of Dunbar, . . . 162

CHAPTER IX

Results of the Battle of Dunbar—Buckingham—The Start—Improved Position of the King—Remonstrants and Resolutioners—Malignants restored—Coronation—The King's Policy—The New Army—Argyle leaves the King—English Royalists betrayed—Precautions of the Government—The March to

PAGE

Worcester—The Defeat of Derby—The King at Worcester—The Battle—The Flight—The Fate of the Prisoners—Effects of the Defeat, ... 184

CHAPTER X

Efforts of the English Government to capture the King—The Flight from Worcester—Whiteladies—Charles desires to go to London—Decides to cross the Severn—Goes to Madeley—Returns to Boscobel—The Royal Oak—The Adventures of Wilmot—Charles at Moseley—At Bentley Hall—The Journey to Bristol—Abbots Leigh—Trent—Flight of Jane Lane to France, . 220

CHAPTER XI

Wyndham's Search for a Ship—Attempt to embark at Charmouth—Adventures at Bridport and Broadwindsor—Return to Trent—Journey to Heale—Quest of Colonel Gounter for a Ship—Journey to Brighton—Charles sails from Shoreham—Lands at Fécamp—Goes to Rouen—Meets his Mother at Moriceaux—Arrives at Paris—Gives a fictitious Account of his Adventures—His Reticence—His Gratitude to all who aided his Escape, ... 254

CHAPTER XII

The State of Europe in 1650—Embassies sent by Charles to Persia and Morocco—To Poland—To Moscow—To Madrid—The Journey of Hyde and Cottington—Their Reception in Spain—The Murder of Ascham—Rupert on the Spanish Coast—The Recognition of the Commonwealth by Spain—The Dismissal of Charles's Ambassadors—The Mission of Meynell to Rome—The State of Ireland—The Treaty with Charles IV. of Lorraine, ... 284

CHAPTER XIII

The Quarrel of the Queen with James of York—James's flight to Brussels—Death of the Prince of Orange—English Envoys at the Hague—Religious Dissensions at the English Court in Paris—The Return of James to Paris—The general Distrust of the Queen—Anxiety for the King—The State of France, . 310

CHAPTER XIV

PAGE

Melancholy of Charles—Marriage Projects—Mlle. de Longueville —Mlle. de Montpensier—Mme. de Châtillon—The Third War of the Fronde—Departure of James to the Army—Condition of the English in Paris—Charles mediates between the King and the Princes—Charles persuades Lorraine to retreat —Anger of the Princes—The Louvre attacked by the Mob—The Battle of St. Antoine—The Retreat of the English Court to St. Germains—The Return to Paris—The Decay of the Princes' Party—The Retreat of Lorraine and Condé—The Return of Louis XIV. to Paris—The Dispersion of the Fronde, 334

CHAPTER XV

The Policy of Mazarin—He sends a Resident to England—Remonstrance of Charles—The Irish desert from Spain—The Earl of Norwich's Mission to Brussels and the Hague—The Duke of Lorraine—Condé—Spain—Charles sends an Ambassador to the Diet—Money granted to Charles by the Diet—Failure in Payment—Proposed Embassy to Rome—Hopes from the Dutch—Mynheer Borell—Charles's Offers to the States—His Appeal to Denmark—Internal Divisions of the Dutch—Charles's Appeals to Princess Mary—The Treaty of England and the United Provinces—Denmark included in it—Sweden treats with England—Abdication of Queen Christina —Portugal—France treats with England—Charles left without an Ally, ... 358

CHAPTER XVI

The Union of England and Scotland—Discontent of the Scots—Dunnottar Castle—Middleton's Escape to France—The Scots' Message to the King—The Highland Association—Middleton goes to Holland for Supplies—The Princess of Orange—Activity of the Highlanders—Colonel Bampfylde turns Traitor —Is sent to the King with Messages—Lorne joins the Royalists —Glencairn takes Command—Adventure of Colonel Wogan—The Royalists at Ruthven—Secession of Lorne—Secession of Balcarres—Moray accused of Treason—Arrival of Middleton —Secession of Glencairn—The King's Presence desired—Defeat of the Royalists—The Chiefs make Terms—Middleton and Napier escape, ... 389

CHAPTER XVII

PAGE

The Hopeless Condition of Ireland—The State of England—Persecution of Cavaliers—Puritan Factions—The Revival of Royalism—The Royalists hope for Lambert's Adhesion—Alliance of John Lilburne with Buckingham—General desire for the King's Restoration—Cromwell becomes Protector—Scheme for a new Royalist Insurrection—The Sealed Knot—Bampfylde betrays the Plot—Henshaw's Assassination Plot—The Question of Charles's Complicity—Plans of the Conspirators—Failure of the Plot—Escape of Henshaw—Arrest of Gerard and Vowell—Their Execution, ... 412

CHAPTER XVIII

The King's Poverty—Sources of Income—Sufferings of the Exiles—Return of the Exiles to Paris—The Queen's Attempt to prevent it—Reasons for Nicholas's Absence—His Discontent—Dissensions at the Louvre—Charles's Hatred of the Scots and Presbyterians—The Queen's Attempt to gain Hyde—Her Hostility to him—Causes of it—Charles and De Retz—Indolence and Instability of Charles's Character—Ormonde supports Hyde—The New Council chosen—Berkeley's Claims—He breaks with Hyde—James of York obtains Leave to join Turenne—Wogan's Accusation of Long—Long's Flight from Court—The factious State of the Court—Charles's Inability to control his Followers, ... 429

CHAPTER XIX

The Return of Rupert—The Queen and Sir Edward Herbert—The Swordsmen—Factions at Court—The King's Illness—James and Henry of Gloucester in Paris—The Return of the French Court, December 1653—Plots against Hyde—Attempt to restore Long—Accusation of Hyde by Long—Accusation of Hyde by Herbert and Gerard—Acquittal of Hyde—General Dissatisfaction with the King—Fears for his Religion—Complaints of his Indiscretion—Spies at Court—Complaints of Jermyn's Influence—Licence of the King's Life in Paris—Charles's desire to leave France—Difficulties in the Way of Departure—Charles sells the Guns of the *Swallow*—His

PAGE

Quarrel with Rupert—The Queen and Jermyn support Rupert—Scheme to send James to Scotland—Message sent by Seymour from England—The Cardinal assists Charles's Departure—Charles fails to be reconciled with the Queen—Departure of Herbert and Rupert—Hyde's Audience of the Queen—Charles's Departure—His Journey—Low Ebb of his Fortunes. 402

INDEX, ... 497

ILLUSTRATIONS

Sophie, Princess Palatine (Electress of Hanover), *Frontispiece*

Louis xiv. of France, ... *Facing page* 24

Anne Marie-Louise de Montpensier (La Grande Mademoiselle), ... „ 104

James Graham, Marquis of Montrose, . . . „ 144

Charles ii. of England, ... „ 220

Charles iv., Duke of Lorraine, ... „ 300

James Stuart, Duke of York, ... „ 324

Cardinal Mazarin, ... „ 358

Anne of Austria (Queen of France), ... „ 446

Rupert, Prince Palatine, ... „ 492

CHAPTER I

General character of the Exile—Departure of the Prince of Wales from Jersey.

THE history of an exile is, in the nature of things, a melancholy history; and that of the first Stuart exile is no exception to the rule. There is, moreover, a lamentable lack of dignity about the whole episode, which is the more remarkable by contrast with the preceding acts in the tragedy of which it formed a part. The first Charles was wont to say: 'If I cannot live a King, I will die a gentleman!' and kept his word to the letter.[1] We see the second Charles reduced to beg his bread, importuning emperors, kings, princes, even private persons, for the very means whereby to live; patiently enduring slight and insult, lest resentment should cost him the pittance contemptuously doled out to him. We see him engaged in ceaseless, sometimes discreditable, intrigues, plotting, planning, scheming, bargaining with nations, parties, persons, and offering terms—often incompatible in themselves—to each in turn.

And the fortunes of Charles's adherents do not present a much more cheerful picture than do those of their master. The weary, sad-hearted men who maintained the cause of Charles I., and—when that cause was lost—followed his son across the seas, 'into the wilderness of a foreign kingdom,' have not much in common with the gay cavalier of fiction. They were, it is true, 'men of a spirit,' who could say, when poverty pressed hard, 'Yet I have a mad kind of humour that keeps me alive

[1] Carte's *Ormonde*, vi. p. 358. *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 316.

and merry, in every place where I come.'[1] They could laugh at the 'ridiculousness' of their position, when death and disaster stared them in the face,[2] but in such mirth there was a touch of bitterness, and, though they showed a brave face to the world, they were, for the most part, sad enough.

For conscience-sake, for love of their Church and King, they had freely sacrificed all that they possessed, soberly counting the cost of what they did. 'And I beseech you,' wrote one to a friend who had bewailed the hardness of his lot, 'give me leave to believe yet that the trouble of mind which you have suffered by anything you have done . . . is very much inferior to what you would have suffered if you had not done it; so great a difference is there in the peace of the heart when a man hath done all on his part, and when he hath fallen short of it.'[3]

Some indeed there were who had nothing to lose, some who found the trial too hard to bear, and returned to make their peace in England, a few who did worse, and sold the secrets of their King for money. But these were the exceptions. Nearly all might have recovered some part of their property and have dwelt in security at home had they chosen to renounce the cause they followed and submit themselves to Protector or Parliament. They did not so choose. They chose rather separation from all that they held dear, poverty, often little short of actual starvation, a restless, wandering life of suffering and humiliation, ending, for some, upon the scaffold, when they ventured 'on the King's business,' within the dominion of the Commonwealth.

'Wonder not at my silence,' wrote the courtly old Lord Norwich in 1658, 'for I have been dull, lame, cold, out of money, clothes, and what not, since that my only coat was not quite burnt off, when it was desperately singed, even to such a degree as I was forced to cut it.'[4]

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 255. [2] Cary's *Memorials*, ii. p. 305.
[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 523, 18th March 1650.
[4] *French Papers*, Record Office, cxiv., 6th March 1658.

'I am a better shifter than your Excellency will ever be, and yet was like to starve in Paris, though every person saluted me with "Votre très humble serviteur jusqu'à la mort,"'[1] declared Lord Taafe to Lord Clanricarde. Yet when the same gallant Irishman found himself in Brussels, 'without employment, friends or mutch money,' he refused the offer of an appointment in Portugal, because he believed that the King had need of him, 'Nor did I think this a reasonable time to be ingadged in Portugal, whilst my master is soliciting aids from Spain,' he explained.[2]

Another Irish soldier, after representing the very desperate condition to which he himself, his brother officers and men were reduced in Flanders, pathetically begged to know 'whether we may shift, or endeavour to better ourselves elsewhere. But,' he added, 'if your Excellency should think that anyway to annoy his Majesty, I will sooner perish and suffer here, and all those that will sticke to me, than do anything that would reflect upon his Majesty.'[3]

'I do not know that any man is yet dead for want of bread, which really I wonder at!' wrote Sir Edward Hyde in 1653.[4] But none the less stern was his condemnation of those whom misery and want drove to make their submission in England.

In the early days of the exile he had written to Lady Isabella Thynne: 'My prayers are for my friends that God will preserve their innocence, whoever enjoys—or rather possesses—their estates. While I have bread and books I shall think myself very rich, and when I want both, I hope I shall not do any ill thing to get either. So that, my dear Lady, though you are never like to see me live happily again, you shall, I doubt not, hear that I die so honest a man as you shall not be out of countenance for the gratious acceptance you have bestowed

[1] Clanricarde's *Memoirs*, 5th January 1651.
[2] *Carte MSS.*, ccxiii. fol. 356, 11th October 1659.
[3] *Ibid.* fol. 354.
[4] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 179.

upon my faithful affection and services.'[1] And some years later he remonstrated passionately with a friend whose endurance was failing.

'Thinke! thinke! thinke of how little it is to you to dye richer by a thousand pounds! How poor soever my shop is furnished—and God knows it is poor enough —I had rather starve than be supplied by that kind of trading.'[2]

'You can be no more a servant or a pensioner to another Crown, than you can marry another wife!' he protested to Lord Digby.[3] And though many of the Royalists found service in a foreign army, the only means whereby to earn bread for themselves and their families, they never failed to reserve to themselves the right of returning to their own Sovereign whensoever he should see fit to call upon them.

But there is another, and a darker side to the picture. For all their conscious rectitude, peace did not reign in the hearts of the exiles, and they might justly envy those of their comrades who had found death in the beginning of the troubles. It is undeniably easier to fight gallantly and to die bravely than it is to live with dignity and patience through long years of sorrow, hope-deferred, sordid struggle and privation. Common misfortune had not united the Royalists in the bond of brotherly love, and when we look for the high moral tone and nobility of character that all their self-sacrifice seems to presume, we are disappointed. In France, Holland, Germany, or Flanders, whithersoever they followed their master, jealousies, quarrels, dissensions, and intrigues prevailed amongst them. The Queen's party, or 'Louvrians,' waged bitter war against the 'rigid Cavaliers,' led by Hyde and Ormonde, and the 'Swordsmen' who looked to Prince Rupert as their chief, sometimes appeared in opposition to both parties, sometimes united with one against the other. Private feuds and personal quarrels

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, Bodleian Library, xxviii. fol. 297.

[2] *Ibid.* xlviii. fol. 98.

[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 330.

added to the confusion of 'that distracted and disjointed company' and effectually prevented mutual confidence and hearty co-operation for the common cause. Well might Hyde exclaim: 'Oh, Mr. Secretary, the weakness, credulity, and vanity of our friends trouble us little less than the vices of our enemies,' and bewail 'the general corruption and licence of the Court, and indeed of our nation, who here with us, and there with you, have shaken off all those obligations and respects they have been formerly liable to.'[1]

But, as Hyde himself observed, 'it is a very hard thing for people who have nothing to do to forbear doing somewhat which they ought not to do.'[2] Nor was it wonderful 'that men's minds, natures and understandings should be broken with such a current of ill success and calamities, and with so great necessities and wants.'[3] And since the loss of all ordinary and reasonable occupation was added to the sufferings of the exiles, it was, unfortunately, only too natural that they should betake themselves to intrigue, dissension, and duelling, or seek to drown sorrow in illicit pleasures and sensual indulgences.

Noble must have been the soul that passed through the trial unscathed, yet, to the credit of humanity be it said, there were some who did so; honourable, unselfish, conscientious men, who 'served the King for God's sake,'[4] stooped to no baseness, flinched from no danger, and endured all things with silent, uncomplaining courage. Such men were the two great Marquises of Ormonde and Montrose, types, in their steadfast, selfless devotion to an ideal, of all that was best and noblest in the Cavaliers. Charles was, in truth, unworthy of service such as theirs, and happy was he who did not live to see his idol shattered.

To Montrose it was given to die a martyr, protesting

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 523; iii. pp. 88, 108.
[2] *Clarendon, History*, Bk. xiii. p. 145. [3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 337.
[4] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 170.

with his last breath his faith in the justice and virtue of the King who had sent him to his death.[1] Ormonde lived to drag out many weary years of exile, suffering all kinds of privation, and struggling to keep his Sovereign in the paths of righteousness and honour, knowing the while that he struggled vainly.[2]

What Charles might have become in happier circumstances it is impossible to guess. His childhood had been carefully trained in principles of religion and morality, and it had been his father's intention to watch over the boy's development personally.[3] But the outbreak of the Civil War frustrated this intention, enforced the separation of father and son, interrupted the young Prince's education, and threw him loose upon the world ere he was strong enough to bear the strain.

He was regarded in his early youth as a most virtuous and promising prince. 'Without doubt he hath a sweetness of disposition not easy to be corrupted,'[4] asserted Hyde in 1647. But he was soon to learn that in that very 'sweetness' lay Charles's most fatal weakness, namely an incapacity to deny anything to anybody, a shrinking from 'contestations,' and a reluctance to express disapproval even when he felt it strongly.

'If I did not hope he would outgrow that infirmity it would break my heart,'[5] declared Hyde. But Charles did not outgrow it; on the contrary, it grew on him, and this constitutional indolence and lack of moral courage was the root of all his failings. In character he was more Bourbon than Stuart, a fact quickly perceived by his cousin, Mademoiselle de Montpensier, who, commenting on his frivolity and disinclination to business, concluded with the remark: 'Ce n'est pas que je n'eusse par là du connaître mon sang; car les Bourbons sont gens

[1] *Wigton Papers*, Maitland Club, ii. p. 488.
[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 387.
[3] *Clarendon, History*, vii. p. 325.
[4] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 319.
[5] *Ibid.* iii. pp. 13, 46. Hyde to Nicholas, 18th March 1650; 3rd February 1652.

fort appliqués aux bagatelles et peu aux solides.'[1] And Charles himself, only too conscious of his resemblance to Henri IV. of France, was wont to excuse his vices on the plea that they were an inheritance bequeathed to him by his Bourbon grandfather. 1645-1646

The saddest aspect of the exile is seen in the moral ruin that it wrought, not in the King alone, but also in many of his followers.

Charles was but just sixteen when, in obedience to his mother's commands, he sailed from Jersey for the shores of France. The Royalist army was already broken and dispersed, the Royalist party, though not quite destroyed, was, for the time, dormant, only a few castles still held out for the King, and the King himself was practically a prisoner in the hands of the Scots.

From the time that he had begun to contemplate the probability of defeat, the King's chief anxiety had been for the safety of his heir, and in March 1645 he had sent him to Bristol as nominal commander of the western forces. The council appointed to attend on the young Prince was composed of six of the King's most trusted friends, the Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Southampton, the Lords Capel, Hopton, and Culpepper, and Sir Edward Hyde, Chancellor of the Exchequer. The two first refused to quit the King, and therefore the care of the Prince's person, as well as the direction of his affairs, devolved on the remaining four. These, though men of much worth, lacked the prestige of rank possessed by the other two, and this circumstance considerably enhanced their difficulty in coping with the unruly generals of the western army.

Hyde and Culpepper were undoubtedly the most able of the councillors. Both had sat in the Long Parliament, adhering at first to the popular party but going over to the King in January 1642, when they found that the existing constitution and the Established Church were endangered by the 'reformers.'

[1] *Mémoires de Mdlle. de Montpensier* (edited Chéruel, 1891), i. p. 224.

Hyde, better known by his later title of Earl of Clarendon, had been bred to the law, had much affected the company of wits and scholars, and was proficient in all branches of polite learning. He was gifted with eloquence of both tongue and pen, and had a fine turn for sarcasm, by which, as he had 'more wit than discretion,' he made himself many a foe. His honesty, loyalty, and personal integrity were absolute, he was sincerely religious, and uncompromisingly attached to the Anglican Church. Culpepper had been a soldier in his youth and was of rougher mould than Hyde; he had 'no ornaments of education,' but possessed excellent natural abilities, marred unfortunately by faults of temper which rendered him universally disliked.

Capel, who had sacrificed a large fortune and a quiet life of domestic felicity in the service of his Sovereign, was more distinguished for nobility of character than for any administrative talents, and Hopton, who, as Sir Ralph Hopton, had led the western army with eminent success, was perhaps a better soldier than statesman.

In addition to the council the Prince took with him his governor, the Earl of Berkshire, a person chiefly remarkable for his insignificance, who had been appointed to the governorship only because the King had intended, by his own care of his son, to make that office a sinecure.

Throughout the year 1645 the young Prince was pushed gradually westwards by the advance of Fairfax's victorious army; by February 1646 he had reached Pendennis Castle, on March 4th he removed to the Scilly Isles, and thence on April 16th to Jersey.

By this time the King had become convinced that his own dominions were no longer a safe residence for his son, and he wrote from Oxford, and again from Newcastle, to bid his wife summon the boy to Paris: 'I think not Prince Charles safe in Jersey, therefore send for him to wait upon thee with all speed—for his preservation is the greatest hope for my safety. And in God's name

let him stay with thee till it be seen what ply my business will take. And for my sake let the world see that the Queen seeks not to alter his conscience.'[1] 1646 May

The Queen herself desired few things more ardently than to have her son with her, and had already written to his council, commanding that he should be sent to her forthwith. 'Il y va de votre obéissance, de la vie du Roi, du bien de mon fils et du Royaume; c'est pourquoi il n'y a plus disputer là dussus,' she concluded.[2] And, on the same day, she wrote also to the Prince himself:—

'DEARE CHARLES—having reseauved a lettre from the King I have dispatch this berear, Dudley Wiatt to you, with the copie of the lettre, by which you may see the King's command to you and to me. I make no doubt that you will obey it, and suddeyneley; for sertainly your coming hether is the securitie of the King your father. Therfor make all the hast you can to showe yourself a dutifull sonne, and a carefull one, to doe all that is in your power to serve him: otherwise you may ruine the Kinge and yourself.

'Now that the King is gonne from Oxford, whether to the Scotch or to Irland, the Parliament will, with alle ther power, force you to come to them. Ther is no time to be lost, therfor loose none, but come speedeley. I have writt more at large to Milord Culpepper, to show it to your Counsell. Ile say no more to you, hoping to see you shortley. I would have send you Harry Jermin but he is goinge to the Court with some commands from the King to the Queen-Regente.

'Ile adde no more to this but that I am your most affectionat mother, HENRIETTE MARIE R.

'For me dearest Sonne.'[3]

Charles was eager to obey his mother, but his council considered that the step would be productive of disaster,

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 230, 239, 15th April, 28th May 1646.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 231. [3] *Cal. Clarendon State Papers*, ii. No. 2214.

and that if the King were truly informed of the state of affairs he would wish otherwise. They persuaded the Prince that it would not be suitable for him to go to France until that country, having openly declared for his father, sent him a formal invitation to come over. And Charles therefore sent Capel and Culpepper to the Queen, to assure her that Jersey was still safe, and that even if the island were taken, escape from the castle would be easy.

At the same time Hyde wrote a long and earnest letter to Lord Jermyn, the chief officer of the Queen's household, who had long been her principal confidant, urging the many reasons against the Prince leaving his native land. The arguments which had been adduced by the Queen and Jermyn himself were put aside lightly. The Prince was absolutely safe in Jersey; the Queen could provide for his support there as easily as in France. As to his presence being necessary to engage the aid of France, that should precede, and not follow, his arrival. Finally, the question of his education and personal advantage could not outweigh grave political considerations.

On the other hand, there were many reasons for his remaining in Jersey. His voluntary departure would make him difficult of access to loyalists, and alienate hearts that might have turned to him. Moreover France could not be trusted. She had failed to keep the promises that she had made to the King, and she might, if she chose to make peace with the Parliament, detain the Prince for her own ends. Further, the sympathy of all other states would be cooled if the Prince threw himself into the arms of France. Lastly, there was the danger of his contracting an unsuitable marriage, and of his being perverted to the Roman Church, which would be undoubtedly fatal to the Royalist cause, bound up as it was with the cause of the English Church. 'For though such who have the happiness to know the prudence and resolution of the Queen, by all means to prevent any attempt to be

made on him that way; and they who have the honour to know the Prince, and are witnesses of his piety and devotion, will not much apprehend any such attempt, if it were made, yet very many . . . will not be without sad fears and apprehensions. However, they whose business it is, not to prove what they say, but to have what they say believed, will little doubt the getting credit with the people, or that it will be hard to persuade them—who believed the King a Papist, when he was seen every day at Church in England—to believe the Prince a Papist, when he shall have no Church in France to go to.'[1]

While the matter was pending, Lord Digby, the Secretary of State, arrived at Jersey, full of a scheme to take the Prince to Ireland. George, Lord Digby, the eldest son of the Earl of Bristol, had played a considerable part in the Civil War, contributing not a little to the ruin of the Royal cause by his wild and ever-varying projects and his bitter animosity to Prince Rupert. He was a man of great personal charm, brilliantly clever, but erratic, incorrigibly vain, and sanguine, and unstable as water. He was addicted to violent, but brief, friendships, and was at that moment passionately devoted to James Butler, Marquess of Ormonde, whose acquaintance he had recently made in Ireland. Ormonde had been struggling with the Roman Catholic rebellion in that country for the past three years. But now, at last, there seemed to be a prospect of peace, and articles of treaty had been drawn up by which the Irish engaged to assist the King with ten thousand men. The Papal Nuncio, however, Giovanni Rinnucini, Archbishop of Fermo, who was with the Confederate Catholics at Kilkenny, refused to sanction any peace which did not secure the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, together with the possession of all churches and ecclesiastical property. This the King, for obvious reasons, dared not concede, and without the concurrence of the Roman clergy the peace would be a dead letter.

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 231.

It occurred to Digby that the mere presence of the Prince of Wales in Ireland would suffice to overthrow the Nuncio, and would quickly compose all factions. He offered the suggestion to Ormonde, who, 'being a wise man,'[1] refused to persuade the Prince in a matter so serious as the disposal of his person. Digby, who never suffered from diffidence, and 'always concluded that that was fit to be done which his thoughts first suggested to him, and never doubted the execution of anything which he once thought fit to be attempted,'[2] cheerfully undertook the task.

He arrived in Jersey two days after the departure of Capel and Culpepper, and at once communicated his plan to the remaining councillors. Greatly to his surprise, he found that they deemed the risk too great, and that the Prince himself preferred to await the Queen's reply to his message. Nothing daunted, Digby next conceived the idea of inviting the Prince on board his ship, engaging his attention while anchor was weighed, and so carrying him off against his will. This project he chanced to mention to Sir Edward Hyde, who naturally refused to countenance it, and advised him to go over to France and consult the Queen.[3] The suggestion caught the Secretary's capricious fancy, and, never doubting his ability to win the Queen's support, he rushed off to Paris with the same inconsiderate haste that had brought him to Jersey. There, instead of converting the Queen, he was himself converted by the combined representations of Henrietta and Cardinal Mazarin. The Cardinal promised that, when the Prince was landed in France, an ambassador, chosen and instructed by Henrietta herself, should be at once despatched to England and empowered to declare war against the Parliament in the name of France if her demands on the King's behalf were not immediately conceded. An army should then be raised in France and placed under the command of the Prince of Wales, who

[1] *Clarendon, History*, ix. p. 13. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. App. lviii-lx.

would thus enjoy the honour of restoring his father. This, with a little personal flattery, and the gift of ten thousand pistoles—over £7000—wherewith to maintain the war in Ireland, was more than enough to convince the too credulous Digby. He had, he wrote to Ormonde, found 'more reasonable people in France than at Jersey,' and he saw a possible source of revenue in the Prince's residence at Paris. 1646 June

'They do so much desire to have him, as they will be willing to purchase the continuance of possession at a very good rate.'[1]

Culpepper had been also won over by the Queen, but Capel remained unconvinced, the more so because the latest comer from the King, John Ashburnham, assured him that the Prince's departure from Jersey would be 'very pernicious.' He therefore offered to go to Newcastle, lay the facts before the King, and bear his commands to Jersey.[2]

But, in the meantime, Mazarin had found a way to stimulate the Queen to action. He wrote to her cousin, the Prince of Condé, stating that he had knowledge of a plot among the Prince of Wales's suite to betray him to the Parliament for the sum of £20,000.[3] Condé showed the letter to Henrietta, as the Cardinal expected, and Henrietta, intolerant of further delay, immediately sent the Lords Jermyn, Wilmot, and Wentworth to bring her son to France.

They arrived in Jersey on Saturday, June 20th, accompanied by Digby, Capel, and Culpepper, and with a suite of nearly eighty gentlemen and servants in attendance. Jermyn bore a letter from the Queen to the Prince, by which she required instant obedience to her former commands, gave assurance of the honourable intentions of France, and promised that all the Prince's affairs should

[1] Carte's *Ormonde*, vi. p. 394-9.

[2] *Clarendon*, *History*, x. p. 22.

[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxviii. fol. 74, 76. Mazarin doubtless referred to Lord Newport's attempt to bribe the Lieutenant of the Guard to take the Prince to Westminster in February 1646.

be managed by his council, as heretofore. She further engaged herself to observe the King's wishes in respect of their son's religion and marriage, and not to oppose his departure from her if the council should judge it necessary.

To this she appended an extract from one of her husband's letters to herself.

'It is true that my person will not want danger, but I want not probabilities of reasonable good security, the chiefest of which is Prince Charles being with thee. Concerning whom I desire thee—as thou lovest me—first that thou wouldst not endeavour to alter him in religion, nor so much as trouble him in that point: Next that thou wouldst not thyself, nor suffer him to be engaged in any treaty of marriage without first having my consent.'[1]

Charles received the letter in his bedchamber, where he had a private conference with Jermyn. He then called in the council, with the other lords, to whom the Queen's letter was read aloud. A grim silence followed the reading, broken at last by Hyde, who moved that the council should be adjourned till the next day. Jermyn protested that the Queen's commands were absolute. Hyde retorted that the responsibility rested solely with the council, and that Jermyn had no right to speak to the question at all. A heated debate followed, and the meeting was finally adjourned as proposed. That same evening Jermyn and Digby took Hyde for a walk and continued the discussion privately. Jermyn soon tired and turned back, saying that Digby would easily convert the Chancellor, but all the Secretary's eloquence failed to make any impression on the mind of Hyde.

The next day was Sunday. In the morning there was service and sermon in the Castle, and in the afternoon the council met again. Capel gave an account of all that had passed at Paris, remarking that it was strange that France had sent no invitation to the Prince, nor even a pass to go thither. He pointed out that it had been the

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxviii. fol. 95.

fatal advice of France that had induced the King to trust the Scots, and he dwelt much on the fact that Ashburnham had brought no instructions for the Prince from his father. Finally he renewed his offer to seek the King, with the proviso that if he did not return within a month the Prince should obey his mother.

Berkshire, Hopton, and Hyde all expressed their opinion that Charles should await a direct order from the King, since his going might break the hoped for treaty with the Scots, produce religious scandals, and unite the King's enemies. Culpepper said that he thought the King's command positive enough. Jermyn and Digby expressed infinite surprise that the good affection of France should be doubted, recapitulated the offers of the Cardinal, and 'negligently insinuating that they knew somewhat more than they spoke,' put the question to the Prince whether he would go or stay.[1]

Charles answered briefly that he would sail on Tuesday. The councillors, Culpepper excepted, declared their resolution of remaining behind, and the debate concluded for the day.

On Monday afternoon the council met again, and earnestly entreated the Prince to at least defer his journey. But the boy proved obdurate, and, after some sharp altercation with the victorious party, the dissenters kissed the Prince's hand and sadly withdrew. It was Charles's intention to sail at five o'clock the next morning, but contrary winds delayed his departure three wretched days, during which he suffered none of his suite to leave the Castle, lest they should be missing when the wind and tide served; they were consequently unable to go to bed or even to obtain food beyond what the governor's wife, Lady Carteret, was able to provide. Charles himself 'stayed with great impatience'; by Wednesday evening he was in such a state of mind that he was with difficulty prevented from setting sail for St. Malo, in spite of all,

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxviii. fol. 116. Memorandum concerning the Prince's remove from Jersey.

and on Thursday morning between three and four A.M. he actually started, but was driven back by the wind and forced to land again.

The councillors came daily to visit him, but 'stayed very little time, there growing every day a visible strangeness between them and the rest, in so much that they had little speech together and the last day none; the other lords sitting on the rock of the water side, whilst they walked upon the bowling green with the Prince, who quickly left them, and they returned.'[1]

On Thursday evening Charles would wait no more, and at five o'clock he again embarked in a small shallop, resolved to row over if the wind would not serve. The councillors took their final leave of him weeping bitterly,[2] and he was led on board between Jermyn and Digby, each holding him firmly by an arm, lest he should prove recalcitrant at the last moment.[3]

The wind soon shifted, whereupon Charles changed into a larger vessel, and Digby, after convoying him a little way, turned off for Ireland. The night was stormy, 'un temps d'orage, accompagné d'éclair, tonnerre, pluie et vent pêle mêle,'[4] but about eleven P.M. they succeeded in putting in at Coutainville, and there Charles landed at daybreak on the morning of Friday, June 26, with the Lords Jermyn, Culpepper, Brentford, Wentworth, Witherington, and Wilmot, four Chaplains, chief of whom was Dr. Earles, and a large suite of gentlemen and servants, including shoemakers, tailors, and laundresses. From Coutainville he continued his journey to Paris, and thence to St. Germains, where he was joyfully received by his mother, whom he had not seen for more than two years.[5]

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxviii. fol. 116.

[2] *Chevalier's Journal*, Hoskins, i. p. 428.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 445.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 446.

[5] For a full account of the above proceedings see *Clarendon MSS.*, xxviii. p. 116. *Clarendon, History*, x. pp. 37-45. *Hoskins*, i. pp. 427-44.

CHAPTER II

The Flight of the Queen—The State of France—Position of the Prince—Unpopularity of the Queen—Charles at the French Court—His Courtship of Mademoiselle—Anxiety of his Councillors.

THE Queen, Henrietta Maria, had fled from Exeter on the approach of Essex's army in June 1644, and, making her way in great peril and suffering to Falmouth, had there embarked in a Dutch vessel and sought refuge in France. Her two-weeks'-old baby she was forced to leave behind her, and for this reason her conduct has often been regarded as heartless, but she was in fact actuated less by personal fears than by consideration for her husband. 1644

The woman who had returned through a heavy cannon fire at Burlington to rescue a dog accidentally left behind, who had led an army to her husband's aid, and who, when she fled, entreated her captain to blow up his ship with all on board, rather than let it fall into the hands of the Parliament, was no coward.[1] But she had been impeached of high treason in May 1643, and she remembered that fear for her life had induced the King to make what he himself characterised as 'that base, unworthy concession concerning Strafford,' for which, he confessed, he had been 'most justly punished.'[2] She knew, only too well, what power her capture would put into the hands of his enemies, and therefore she chose to relieve him from the anxiety of her presence in England.

[1] *Mémoires de Madame de Motteville* (edition 1824, Pettitot), ii. p. 114.

[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 296. King to Queen, 21st November 1646.

'I will show you, by this last action, that there is nothing which lies so near my heart as your safety,' she wrote to him, ere she departed; 'my life is but a small thing compared with that. For, in the present state of your affairs, your condition would be in great peril if you came to my relief, and I know that your affection would make you risk all for my sake. And so I prefer to risk this miserable life of mine, a thing worthless enough in itself, saving in so far as it is precious to you.'[1]

In the careworn Queen who had returned to the home of her childhood, it was hard to recognise the bright young girl who had quitted it nearly twenty years before. Her beauty was gone, and her natural gaiety had given way to so profound a melancholy that she wept incessantly. Yet her wit, courage, and personal fascination had not deserted her. 'She had,' says her friend, Madame de Motteville, 'something in her face so charming that she was beloved by all,' and 'a brilliant wit that never failed to please.' Often she would smile a jest through her tears, endeavouring to check them, *pour divertir la compagnie*.

Her reception in her native land was of the kindest, pity combining with affection to secure her welcome. To the people of France she was, before all, the daughter of Henri le Grand. To Gaston, Duc d'Orléans, she was a favourite sister; to the House of Condé a distressed relative who had not yet offended by opposing its ambition; while her sister-in-law, the Queen-Regent, was 'ravished' to succour the wife of Charles of England, from whom she had received much kindness in her earlier days.[2]

Henrietta was therefore received with all the honour due to a queen and a daughter of France. She was granted a pension of 1200 francs a day, and, for a short time, she appeared in regal equipage, with ladies of quality, maids of honour, carriages, guards, and footmen.' But, with all her faults, she was not a woman to live in luxury while her husband was in the utmost straits for money; all she could obtain she sent to him, and, little

[1] *'Madame' J. Cartwright*, p. 4. [2] *De Motteville*, ii. pp. 85-127.

by little, her state fell from her until, says her niece, 'nothing could have been further from her dignity than were her train and surroundings.'[1] 1644-1646

At that time the King, Louis XIV., was only six years old, and the most prominent figure in the French Court was his mother, Anne of Austria. Though no longer young, the Queen-Regent was still handsome, with beautiful eyes, abundant auburn hair, and a throat and hands which were the admiration of Europe. In character she was kind and generous, a good friend, a sympathetic and trustworthy confidant. She loved few, but loved strongly, hated with equal fervour, and was passionately attached to her little son. Her piety was ardent and sincere. She possessed no commanding powers of intellect, but had enough good sense to recognise genius in others; and thus it came to pass that she had committed herself absolutely to the guidance of Cardinal Mazarin, the pupil and successor of Richelieu.[2] Present or absent, he ruled her, and through her France, nor did she, through the many trials that beset her, ever swerve from her adherence to him. This steadfastness, together with the long private conferences which scandalised the Court, produced a rumour that the minister possessed for the Queen attractions other than political, and it was supposed by very many that he was actually her husband. His personality lent colour to the scandal. He was, at the beginning of the Regency, about forty years of age, tall, well-made, very handsome, and *d'une société charmante.* The haughty French nobles, who hated him, could not deny his fascination, and the Queen's letters to him, which are still extant, leave no room for doubt that she loved him. It is even possible that 'a marriage of conscience' had taken place, for Mazarin, though a cardinal, had never taken priest's orders, and was therefore free to marry.[3]

[1] *Mémoires de Mademoiselle de Montpensier* (edition 1891, Chéruel), i. pp. 98, 99.

[2] *De Motteville*, i. pp. 319-29.

[3] Renée's *Nièces de Mazarin*, p. 48; Chéruel's *Minorité de Louis XIV.*, i. p. 359, and ii. p. 126.

Personally the Cardinal cared little for abuse, scandal, or satire, and never showed himself revengeful because the hatred he evoked gave him no pain: it was, he said, simply a testimony to success.[1] By policy he was conciliatory to all, gentle, suave, plausible, lavish of promises, which he kept only so far as was convenient to himself. He seemed, said one of his enemies, always *au désespoir* that his dignity as cardinal deterred him from humbling himself to others as much as he could have wished.[2]

But all his humility could not reconcile the French nobility to the low-born, foreign upstart who kept their ambition in check. The three great houses of the blood-royal—those of Orléans, Condé, and Vendôme, were a constant source of danger to the Crown and country. First in rank, and least in personal importance, came Gaston, Duc d'Orléans, son of Henri IV., and uncle of Louis XIV. He had courage and some military skill, and had thought to profit by the King's minority to exalt his own power. But his vacillating nature, his habitual indecision, and the weakness that subjugated him to the rule of favourites made him less dangerous than he might have proved. His second wife, Marguerite de Lorraine, came of a family hostile to France, but, though she permitted her court to be made a centre of intrigue, she was too indolent to do much harm. Gaston's daughter, by his first wife, known as La Grande Mademoiselle, was of another temperament, and showed herself more enterprising than did either her father or stepmother.

Second to Orléans came César de Vendôme, the illegitimate son of Henri IV. and Gabrielle d'Estrées. By his wife, Françoise de Lorraine, he had two sons, Louis Duc de Mercœur, and François, Duc de Beaufort. The younger son had aspired to be royal favourite, and, being thwarted by Mazarin, had betaken himself to intrigue against the Court, an occupation in which he found his personal beauty of great service, since it gained him an

[1] *Lettres de Mazarin*, Chéruel, ii. p. 928.

[2] *Mémoires du Cardinal de Retz* (edition 1824), i. pp. 63, 64.

extraordinary influence over the populace. But in August 1643 he had been arrested on a charge of conspiring to murder the Cardinal, and his family temporarily quitted the Court.

Greatest of the three great houses was that of Condé. Henri de Bourbon, Prince de Condé, was a man of considerable ability, mean, ambitious, and unscrupulous. His wife, that beautiful Charlotte de Montmorenci whom the violent, but futile, passion of Henri IV. had made famous in youth, was a woman of great force of character, clever, haughty, and as ambitious as her husband. The wonderful beauty of their daughter, Anne-Geneviève de Bourbon, Duchesse de Longueville, was a power not to be despised in a country where the intrigues of women ruled supreme, and lastly, the military renown of their son Louis, Duc d'Enghien, who at the age of twenty-two had defeated the Spanish army at Rocroi, and had ever since pursued a brilliantly victorious career in Flanders and Germany, gave them a position, and a claim on the State which it was impossible to ignore.

There was also the Huguenot element to reckon with, and among the Huguenots were some of the best generals of France, notably the famous Vicomte de Turenne. But in the multitude of his enemies Mazarin found safety; he excited their mutual rivalry, and played off one against the other with consummate skill, notwithstanding the deplorable state of the country, which rendered his task doubly difficult.

Ever since 1635 France had been engaged in an exhausting struggle with both branches of the house of Austria, a struggle which was indeed the last act of the Thirty Years' War. She was obliged to maintain large armies in Spain, Lorraine, Flanders, on the Rhine, in Bavaria, and in Italy, all at once. The treasury was empty, the taxes exhausted the country and exasperated the people; the Government had to cope, not only with external enemies, but with internal revolt, constant riots, and the factious opposition of the Parliament of Paris,

222055

inspired and fostered by a discontented nobility. For all which reasons Henrietta's hopes of assistance were doomed to disappointment, and her entreaties for succour to be sent to England fell on deaf ears.

Personally Mazarin sympathised with Charles I., and wished nothing less than the establishment of a strong republic in England which would be able to interfere in continental affairs, and would be only too likely to excite the French Huguenots to rebellion. But the French Government was in no state to undertake fresh burdens, and the Cardinal confined his efforts on Charles's behalf to sending ambassadors to mediate in England, endeavouring the while not to offend the popular party irrevocably.

In accordance with this policy he had desired to have the Prince of Wales in France, where his presence would be a standing threat to the English Parliament, but, at the same time, he wished the Parliament to believe that the Prince had come uninvited. Therefore Charles's arrival was ignored by the Court for nearly two months, and no pension was definitely assigned for his support, though a 'mean addition'[1] was made to that already received by his mother.

This arrangement suited Henrietta well. She, as the daughter, sister, and aunt of the Kings of France, might depend, without shame, upon the French Crown, but it accorded ill with the dignity of England that the heir to the throne should become a pensioner to a foreign court. So argued the Queen, but there was also another reason for her satisfaction. Henrietta loved power, and her son's dependence on her gave her absolute power over his person and over all his servants. Those whom she disliked could be easily kept at a distance, and, since the Prince represented his captive father, the management of affairs fell into his mother's hands. 'The Prince of Wales remained all that time in Paris under the government of his mother,' says Hyde indignantly.; 'nor was it

[1] *Clarendon, History*, x. par. 59.

desired that he should meddle in any business or be sensible of the unhappy condition the royal family was in. . . . Nor was the Prince himself ever master of ten pistoles to dispose as he desired. The Lord Jermyn was the Queen's chief officer and governed all her receipts, and he loved plenty so well that he would not be without it, whatever others suffered, who had been more acquainted with it. All who had any relation to the Prince were to implore his aid, and the Prince of Wales himself could obtain nothing but by him, which made all persons of honour of the English nation, who were driven into banishment, to choose to make their residence in any other place, as Caen, Rouen, and the like, rather than in Paris. . . . Nor was this economy well liked in France, nor the Prince so much respected as he would have been, if he had lived more like himself and appeared more concerned in his own business.'[1] 1646-1647

All this of course enhanced the Queen's unpopularity, and the exiles complained bitterly of her subservience to Lord Jermyn, her preference for her French servants, and her neglect of themselves.

'Here in our Court no man looks on mee, and the Queene thinks I lost my estate for want of wit, rather than for loyalty to my master . . .' declared Endymion Porter. 'I am so retired into the skirts of a suburb that I scarce know what they do at the Louvre. I want clothes for a Court, having but that pore riding sute I came out of England in.'[2]

'The Queene and Prince have received all the monies due, yet all the servants in the same want, and no money acknowledged to be received!' wrote Hyde.[3] And it was reported that the Queen had spent 2000 pistoles in wedding presents for two of her French servants, while the English were in dire necessity, and the Governor of Jersey was in the utmost straits for want of a less sum which he had lent to the Prince.[4]

[1] *Clarendon, History*, x. par. 176.
[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 71-3.
[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 346.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 344, 345.

There was doubtless some truth, but more injustice, in these complaints, made bitter by the pangs of personal suffering. Henrietta protested that she was misjudged, and that her inability to help the loyalists was not the least of her troubles.[1] But, whether by her fault or her misfortune, the English withdrew to Holland, or to the provincial towns of France, and the few who remained at the Court of St. Germains were not of the best or wisest among the Cavaliers. Jermyn was there, of course, and the Lords Digby, Gerard, Percy, Wilmot, and Wentworth, with others of the same type, who were not too well agreed among themselves, and who, for the most part, passed their time in duelling and settling up old scores. In August 1646 they were joined by Rupert, who had been obliged to leave England after the fall of Oxford.

'Prince Rupert also was well received, and continueth in this Court, where he is very gracious, as also Lord Percy, Lord Wentworth, Lord Wilmot and divers others who have undergone some censures in England,'[2] reported a correspondent to Lord Clanricarde.

But Rupert's presence was not likely to inspire the councillors at Jersey with confidence, and they heard with dismay that their Prince was practically cut off from English society, while the French were 'as familiar with him as could be imagined.'[3]

Though Charles had reached St. Germains in June, it was not until August that the French Court had settled the question of his proper position, of the ceremonies with which he ought to be received, and of the etiquettes necessary to be observed between him and his little cousin, Louis XIV. Henrietta had claimed for her son precedence of Louis on the grounds that the King of Spain had given place to her husband when he made his memorable journey to Madrid. But the Queen-Regent answered that Charles I. had then borne

[1] *De Motteville*, ii. p. 414.
[2] Gilbert, *History of Irish Confederation*, vi. p. 103.
[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 277.

LOUIS XIV OF FRANCE.

From the engraving by Mellan in the British Museum.

the title of 'King of Scots,' not Prince of Wales; and Henrietta, yielding amicably, brought her son to Fontainebleau.[1] 1646 August

They were met in the forest by the King and Queen-Regent. All alighted from their coaches, and Henrietta presented her son to the King, to the Regent, who kissed him, to the Princesse de Condé, and finally to her niece, Anne-Marie-Louise de Montpensier, daughter of Gaston of Orléans.

Charles was not only shy and awkward, but absolutely unable to speak a word of French, while his mother's relations were as ignorant of English; yet, being a tall, good-looking boy, he made a better impression than might have been expected. 'He was well-made,' says Madame de Motteville; 'his dark complexion suited his fine black eyes; his mouth was large and ugly, but he had a very fine figure.'[2] His cousin of Montpensier describes him in nearly the same words. 'He was very tall for his age, with a fine head, black hair, a brown complexion, and altogether very passable in his person; the most inconvenient thing about him was that he neither spoke nor understood a single word of French.'[3]

On the day after his arrival Charles made his visits of ceremony; first to the King, who received him with great solemnity, gave him an arm-chair, and, on his departure, accompanied him to the staircase. As conversation was impossible, the interview must have been somewhat trying, and the cousins regarded one another with immense embarrassment. Louis 'was prudent enough to say nothing for fear of not saying it well, and the Prince of Wales also kept silence.'[4]

From the King, Charles proceeded to visit the Regent, who also offered him an arm-chair. The right to a chair or stool, as the case might be, in the royal presence, was

[1] *De Motteville*, ii. p. 188.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 189.
[3] *Mémoires de Mademoiselle de Montpensier* (edited Chéruel, 1891), i. p. 126.
[4] *De Motteville*, ii. p. 293.

the crucial test of rank, and a burning question at the French Court, therefore Charles's treatment on this point was eminently satisfactory. But after the first visit he and Louis waived their rights by mutual consent, and contented themselves with small stools, except when in the presence of the Queens, when they both remained standing.

During the three days that he stayed at Fontainebleau every effort was made to entertain the young Prince. Hunting expeditions were arranged for him, besides all other amusements that could be crowded into so short a space of time, and the cordiality of his reception seems to have satisfied his English followers.

'The Prince has been at Fontainebleau,' wrote one of them, 'and truly received as civilly, and with as much respect as could be; . . . though we are not to be restored by ceremonies yet these civilities are better than neglects, and I should be glad that our affairs would come to a happy issue without having further obligations to them. Truly the Prince hath behaved himself in this journey so handsomely that he hath gotten the love of all that have seen him, both men and women. Yet, though his entertainment hath been both noble and kind, I do not find anything offered either by present, or in addition to the Queen's exhibition for his subsistence. But that is nothing to me.'[1]

Immediately after the Prince's return to St. Germains he was joined by Dr. Stewart, Dean of the Chapel Royal, who bore a letter from the King, exhorting Charles 'to take his advice and give very much reverence to his opinion in everything which concernes conscience or Church affairs.'[2]

The Prince already had with him Dr. Earles—wit, poet, and divine—who was supposed to read with him

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 254, 255. Charles Murray to Hyde, 28th August 1646.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 253. King to Prince, 26th August 1646.

1646 September-December

every day, and Hobbes, the author of the *Leviathan*, was appointed to teach him mathematics. But Charles seems to have been averse to study of any kind just then, and Dr. Earles excused himself from writing to Hyde on the plea that all the time he could spare from trying to bring the Prince to his books was spent in contriving to get enough food to keep himself alive. Hyde refused to accept the excuse. 'Well: admit you do spend three hours every day that you may spend one with the Prince,' he wrote; 'allow two hours to your dinner, and two hours in the projecting where to get one, you have still a fair time to yourself, one and a half hours a week, without question, to tell me you are alive.'[1]

The truth was that the French Court had returned to Paris, and Charles was enjoying such dissipation as he had never before experienced. The winter of 1646-47 was a particularly gay one; Mazarin had reached the height of his power; his foes were for the time suppressed, the Parliament silenced, the Prince of Condé had reconciled himself to the Queen, and the recent campaign in Flanders had been a complete triumph for France.

The only shadow on the general gaiety was cast by the presence of the young Duc d'Enghien, who had crowned four brilliant campaigns with the capture of Dunkirk in September 1646, and now came to Court intoxicated with his success. His *air victorieux* fretted and chagrined the Court party, his following of young nobles of the army, whose arrogance won them the name of *les petits maîtres*, crowded the Queen's rooms whenever he came to see her, and he was regarded as the man whose friendship or enmity could make or mar the fortunes of all. In December his importance was further increased by the death of his father, whom he succeeded as Prince of Condé, and his growing insolence was a source of the deepest irritation both to the Queen's party and to the rival faction of Orléans.

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 329. 8th January 1647.

Yet, for a while all seemed peace and prosperity; balls, concerts, masques, and plays followed one another in quick succession. The Prince of Wales was present at all, and would have enjoyed himself thoroughly but for his mother's persistent efforts to marry him to his cousin, the daughter of Gaston of Orléans by his first wife, Marie de Bourbon, heiress of the house of Montpensier. As the only child of this marriage, 'Mademoiselle'—such was her title, according to French etiquette—became in her turn an heiress who could bring to the man happy enough to win her four duchies, the Seigneurie of Dombes, the palace of the Luxembourg, and a fortune of 20,000,000 francs.

Small wonder then that the poverty-stricken Henrietta strained every nerve to win these possessions for her exiled son, the more that she believed such a marriage would bring not only the wealth so sorely needed by the Royalists, but also the desired intervention of France. Her efforts to accomplish this wish of her heart were pathetic, so many and so great were the difficulties in her path, and so bravely did she struggle to surmount them. She had to encounter the secret opposition of Mazarin, who had no desire to see Mademoiselle's wealth pass from the royal family of France, the half-hearted disapproval of the lady's father, the reluctance of Mademoiselle, and the passive resistance of Charles himself. Gaston, it is true, was warmly attached to his sister, really regretted her misfortunes, and occasionally went so far as to recommend his nephew's suit to his daughter in his wonted irresolute fashion. But he was utterly incapable of forming decided views on any subject, invariably went to bed in a political crisis, and in this particular case always refused to express any definite wish, far less a command. Mademoiselle knew that in his heart he objected to her marrying any one, for which he had excellent reasons, being really dependent on his wealthy daughter. 'I have heard him often say,' wrote Madame de Motteville, 'that his daughter

supported him, that he was a beggar, she was rich, and that but for her he sometimes would not have had bread to eat.'[1] As for Mademoiselle herself, she was difficult in the extreme. She was vain, ambitious, full of exalted notions concerning her own importance, and though she desired to be 'established' quite as ardently as Mazarin and her father desired to keep her single—a destitute, heretic, and exiled Prince did not seem to her a very desirable *parti*. She was as decided in her views as her father was weak and vacillating, her peculiar position had developed her natural independence of spirit, and she frankly avowed that she considered the question of marriage one to be decided by those most concerned, who should consider their own interests before those of their relations.[2] Henrietta, aware of all this, was clever enough to court her niece personally before addressing herself to Gaston or the Queen-Regent. She had begun the siege, which was to drag through several years, even before Charles's arrival in France, by talking constantly to Mademoiselle of her former happy life in England, the gaiety of the Court, the beauty of the country, and, above all, of the good qualities of her son, the Prince of Wales. 'I guessed her intentions well enough,'[3] commented her niece calmly.

Mademoiselle was exactly three years older than her cousin, the birthday of both being the 29th of May, and at nineteen she was in the height of her charms. 'She had beauty, wit, riches, virtue, and royal birth,' says Madame de Motteville, 'but her vivacity rendered her actions lacking in that gravity which becomes persons of her rank, and she was too easily carried away by her feelings. This temperament sometimes spoilt the beauty of her complexion by causing her to flush, but as she was fair, had fine eyes, a lovely mouth, and a good figure, she had

[1] *De Motteville*, ii. p. 355.
[2] *Mémoires de Mademoiselle de Montpensier*, i. p. 220.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 102.

on the whole an air of great beauty.'[1] Mademoiselle herself informs us that she was tall and carried herself gracefully, that her hands and feet were small and well shaped, her face oval, her eyes blue, her hair a beautiful flaxen, and that she possessed the aquiline Bourbon nose.[2]

It was then no unattractive heiress that young Charles was to woo, and, as Mademoiselle was almost as impulsive, romantic, and generous as she was vain and ambitious, he might have succeeded, in spite of obstacles, had he only risen to the occasion. But this he refused to do. His aversion to his cousin was probably due to resentment of her patronising airs, combined with boyish shyness, but, be the reason what it may, he not only felt no affection for her but declined to pretend any. Taking refuge in his professed ignorance of French, he refused to speak to her, and he suffered her to be wooed by his mother with an obvious passivity which Mademoiselle never forgave.

Her first impression of him at Fontainebleau had not been unfavourable, and Henrietta hastened to follow it up, declaring that the boy was violently enamoured of his cousin, talked of her ceaselessly, and would have sought her company at all hours, had he been permitted. But the young Princess was not easily deceived, and took her aunt's protestations for what they were worth.

'I listened to all that she said, as became me, and did not put that faith in it which she might have wished,'[3] she records.

On the return of the Court to Paris, Madame and Mademoiselle d'Epernon, who had lived much in England, hastened to pour the same flattering tale into Mademoiselle's ears, but the contrast of Charles's conduct was too glaring for their words to gain credence.

'If he had only done it himself I cannot say what

[1] *De Motteville*, iii. p. 102. [2] *Portraits de Mademoiselle*, p. 410.
[3] *Montpensier*, i. p. 127.

might have happened,' confessed his cousin; 'but I know that I valued little all that they said to me on behalf of a man who would say nothing for himself.'[1] 1647 February

Throughout the winter they met daily, and Charles, though still silent, was persuaded to pay some sort of attention to the heiress. He took pains to sit near her at the Court entertainments, always remained uncovered in her presence, and lent himself, more or less willingly, to the various little comedies arranged by his mother.

On one occasion Henrietta undertook to dress her niece for a reception at the Hôtel Choisy, the house of the Chancellor. She came to her rooms accompanied by Charles, who acted as torch-bearer throughout the ceremony, and Mademoiselle observed that the *petite-oie* of her cousin—*i.e.* the ribbons on his stockings, hat, sword, and gloves—had been carefully arranged to match her own ribbons and feathers, the colours of which were black, white, and rose.

When the toilet was completed she went to show herself to the Queen-Regent, but, on her arrival at the Hôtel Choisy she found Charles waiting to hand her from her coach, and he again held a torch for her while she adjusted her hair before entering the reception-room. During the whole evening he followed her about devotedly, and finally attended her home, refusing to pass on until the doors closing behind her hid her from his view. Yet all the time he would not speak a word, and the assurances of Prince Rupert that, *although* Charles knew no French, he understood all that his fair cousin said were no more convincing to Mademoiselle than were the protestations of her aunt.[2]

The death of the old Prince of Condé interrupted the festivities for a time, but towards the end of February there was a magnificent *fête* at the Palais Royal, beginning with an Italian comedy and ending with a grand ball. This time it was the Queen-Regent who amused herself by attiring Mademoiselle, an attention designed to

[1] *Montpensier*, i. p. 128. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 137, 138.

chagrin the young Prince de Condé and his sister, Madame de Longueville.

The heiress wore her favourite colours of black, white, and rose, her dress was covered with diamonds lent by the English Queen, who had not yet been reduced to pawn her last jewels, and the head ornament was of pearls and diamonds, from the centre of which came three feathers, each of a different colour.

'Nothing could have been seen better or more magnificently arrayed than I was that day,' said Mademoiselle; 'and I did not fail to find many people who assured me that my fine figure, my good looks, my pale complexion, and the splendour of my fair hair became me better than all the riches that shone upon my person.'[1]

The dancing took place on a large stage, brilliantly lighted by crystal chandeliers, and the spectators were seated in the amphitheatre. In the centre of the stage was a throne, covered with cloth of gold, but the little King refused to mount it, out of courtesy to the Prince of Wales. Charles being equally polite, the possession of the throne fell to Mademoiselle, who ascended it without scruple. She felt—and was assured that she looked—born to a throne, and thoroughly enjoyed her position, having the King and Prince of Wales literally seated at her feet. But the humble attitude of Charles served rather to increase his cousin's self-esteem than to win her affection to himself. 'While I was there,' she says, 'and the Prince of Wales was at my feet, my heart, as much as my eyes, regarded him *de haut-en-bas*; I had then taken into my head to marry the Emperor, of which there was much probability if the Court had only acted in good faith. . . . The thought of the Empire so entirely occupied my mind that I only regarded the Prince of Wales as an object of pity.'[2]

Marriage with the Emperor, Ferdinand III., was the great ambition of Mademoiselle's life, and, unfortunately for Charles's suit, she was just then nearer to the attain-

[1] *Montpensier*, i. p. 138.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 139, 140.

ment of her wishes than at any other period. Negotiations for peace had been some time in progress, and the ambassador sent to Vienna with the condolences of the French Court, on the death of the Empress, had reported that there seemed to be a general desire amongst the Austrians that Mademoiselle should succeed her. This the Queen-Regent had confided to her niece, while dressing her hair for the ball, seeming herself to approve the project. The truth was that Mazarin had judged it wise to 'amuse' the heiress with this idea, in order to prevent her from conferring her hand on Charles, but for the moment she believed in the Queen's sincerity, and became so extravagantly elated that every one observed it. Henrietta was the first to detect the cause, and told her niece bitterly that she 'had the Emperor on the brain,' a taunt that bore the sting of truth. And Gaston, influenced by his favourite sister, roused himself to remonstrate. 1647

'I know the suggestion of marriage with the Emperor pleases you, and if it does so I will help you as much as is in my power,' he told his daughter; 'but I am convinced that you will never be happy in that country. They live there after the Spanish fashion, and the Emperor is older than myself. That is why I think it will not be to your advantage, and that you could only be happy in England, if affairs improve there, or in Savoy.'[1]

The girl replied that she was the best judge of her own happiness, and that she cared nothing for the age or person of the Emperor, because she valued the 'establishment' above the husband. Acting up to her convictions she endeavoured to conform to the tastes and ideas of her desired bridegroom, assumed the rôle of devotee, dressed carelessly, suffered her hair to grow dishevelled, and contrived at last to become so devout that she forgot the end in the means, and for eight days passionately desired to enter a Carmelite convent.

[1] *De Montpensier*, i. p. 142.

Fortunately, since it is unlikely that her vocation would have endured long, her father peremptorily forbade her profession.

Charles, meanwhile, showed himself a youth of spirit, and resented his cousin's haughty airs by transferring his attentions to the fair Duchess of Châtillon, a lady who possessed beauty and charm 'in a sovereign degree,' and who counted among her lovers some of the noblest names in France. But she had given her heart as well as her hand to the young husband who adored her, and with whom she had eloped in 1646, when their parents refused to sanction their union. Later, when she had become a widow, Charles's devotion to her caused considerable anxiety to his friends, but at that time it could do little harm, and his taste was universally applauded.

Mademoiselle found him no longer subservient to her commands. At a ball given after Easter at the Palais Royal, he refused to dance with Mademoiselle de Guise, as his cousin requested, and led out instead her rival, Mademoiselle de Guerchi, one of the Regent's maids of honour. He even neglected to dance with his cousin herself, a slight of which she complained sharply to Rupert. The elder prince offered grave excuses for Charles's youth and ignorance, but no excuses could mend the matter.[1] Charles's defection was made the more humiliating by the Emperor's marriage with a Tyrolese archduchess.

Mademoiselle saw that she had been deceived, and she was furious. She now resolved that if she could not have the Emperor she would have his brother, the Archduke Leopold, and since she could not trust Queen, Cardinal, or her own father, she would arrange her affairs herself. In this mood she listened to the schemes of one of her friends, M. de Saujeon, a captain of the French Guards in Flanders, who proposed to negotiate the matter through an acquaintance attached to the Archduke's service. Their accomplices betrayed all to the

[1] *De Montpensier*, i. p. 145.

Cardinal, De Saujeon was arrested, and Mademoiselle was summoned to the Queen's private room to answer for her conduct. She found herself confronted by her father; his favourite, the Abbé de la Rivière; and the Queen herself. The Queen received her with bitter reproaches, declaring that she had not only failed in the respect due to her father and her Sovereign, but had intrigued with the enemies of her country, and wound up with the assertion that the Archduke was 'the last of men' and the very worst *parti* that her niece could have chosen.[1]

Mademoiselle defended herself with spirit, and did not hesitate to reproach her father with his failure to secure the imperial alliance, and with his present treatment of her. So fierce was the altercation that it was plainly heard in the anteroom, and Mademoiselle was observed to emerge at last looking 'more proud than ashamed, and with eyes more full of anger than of repentance.'[2]

The Queen, appalled by the girl's boldness, confessed to Madame de Motteville that if she had a daughter who spoke to her as Mademoiselle spoke to Gaston, she would shut her up in a convent. But her confidante's sympathies were with the daughter rather than with the father, of whom she thought shame for his public desertion of his child. 'For,' she explained to the Queen, 'a girl is not blamable for thinking of her establishment, but it is not fitting that it should be publicly known, or even appear, that she has attempted it.'[3] She repeated her sentiments to La Rivière, who effected a formal reconciliation between Gaston and his daughter. De Saujeon was released, but Mademoiselle remained under a cloud, and there was a perceptible coldness between her and the Regent.

In the meantime Charles was growing in the favour of the Court. 'Pity and tenderness for his misfortunes

[1] *De Montpensier*, i. p. 167. [2] *De Motteville*, ii. p. 331.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 353.

added lustre to his good qualities,'[1] and he was considered to have greatly improved in appearance. Moreover, he was no longer absolutely dumb, though he did not shine in conversation and stammered a little, owing to his difficulty with the French language.

In September 1647 a ball was given in his honour at Fontainebleau, whither the Court had migrated and where it continued as gay as ever, in spite of the war, the disasters of the campaign, the ever-lengthening roll of the slain, the impending financial ruin, and the growing discontent of people and Parliament. 'They fought in Flanders, we amused ourselves at Fontainebleau,'[2] says Madame de Motteville sadly. The misfortunes that befell the army of the Prince of Condé in Catalonia only added to the general gaiety. The blow to his reputation was nothing but a satisfaction to the Court, and the news of his failure was received with indecent rejoicing, both at Fontainebleau and at Paris.[3]

All the while the Prince of Wales's councillors watched events from a distance, believing that their worst fears were about to be realised. They had no faith in the friendship of France, and the news that the English Parliament intended to send an ambassador to demand the surrender of the Prince filled them with the acutest anxiety, for they did not doubt that Mazarin would detain, or give up, his guest as best suited his own interest.[4]

This fear proved groundless, but others were more enduring. There was a persistent rumour that Charles had been already married, and Hyde wrote in March 1647: 'I am far from being secure that the intelligence from London of the Prince's marriage may not be true. We were apprehensive of it before he went, and spoke freely to him our opinions of the fatal consequences of it. But when I talked sadly to my Lord Jermyn of it, he

[1] *De Motteville*, ii. p. 292. [2] *Ibid.* p. 285.
[3] Chéruel, *Minorité de Louis XIV.*, ii. pp. 340, 357.
[4] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 345. Hyde to Nicholas, 7th March 1647.

assured me that there were no such thoughts, and, if it ever should be attempted, he would publicly oppose it. But they have no opinions, but for a day, and call it ingenuity not to be peremptory in anything, however reasonable.'[1]

A proposal, emanating from Charles himself, that he should join the French army in Flanders, as Rupert had done, was little less disturbing.

'As for our Prince, better he were in England than in the French army, where we hear he is going,' declared Lord Norwich.[2] England was, however, no safe place for the Prince, and there was no available refuge other than France.

Denmark was proposed, but the idea was quickly rejected. The heir to the throne there was 'a man of no reputation,' and the King, Christian IV., great-uncle of the Prince of Wales, was old and failing. Moreover, he had written to his great-nephew in March 1646 to beg for a loan of twenty ships of war, 'which,' said Hyde, with some justice, 'was so comical a thing that I never could afterwards digest the thought of going to Denmark.'[3]

Thus, in spite of all doubts and heartburnings, the Queen remained in undisturbed possession of her son until May 1648, when the outbreak of the Second Civil War recalled the young Prince from France, withdrew him from the influence of his mother, and restored him to the care of his faithful councillors.

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 345, 7th March 1647.
[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 82, 9th March 1647.
[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 347, 16th March 1647.

CHAPTER III

Causes of the Second Civil War—Parties in Scotland—The Engagement—Projected Rising—Revolt of the Fleet—Escape of the Duke of York—James and the Fleet—Poverty of the Queen—Hyde called to Paris—The Prince goes to Holland—The Queen's Policy—The Prince and the Fleet—Failure of the English Rising—Defeat of the Scots.

1646-1648 WHILE the Prince of Wales remained thus inactive, his mother was labouring diligently in her husband's cause. First she had thought to find salvation in Ireland, then in Scotland, again turned back to Ireland, and all the time negotiated for aid in men and money with France, Holland, Lorraine, and the Papacy.

In Holland the Prince of Orange was willing to aid King Charles, but found himself hampered by the caution of the States-General, who controlled the money supplies. The Duke of Lorraine promised much, but did nothing, and the Pope stood out for religious concessions which Henrietta was unable to make. The position of France has been already seen, and in June 1646 Mazarin sent Pomponne de Bellièvre as ambassador extraordinary to Newcastle, where the King then was with the Scottish army.

De Bellièvre was armed with a memorandum in which Henrietta proposed to her husband that he should yield the control of the militia for a brief period, and should submit to the establishment of the Presbyterian Church in England, the better to divide the Independent and Presbyterian parties. She appended an impracticable scheme for the union of French, Scots, and Irish in the royal cause. Mazarin added private instructions to his

ambassador, whom he bade to sow dissension among the English parties and to accommodate the Scots with the King. 1646

De Bellièvre laboured cautiously but vainly. The establishment of their Church in England and Ireland was to the Scots a *sine quâ non*, and this the King would not concede. He would temporise, beguile his foes with vague phrases, even permit the trial of Presbyterianism for a strictly limited period, with the distinct understanding that he retained power to restore Episcopacy, but he would not make a definite promise with the deliberate intention of breaking it, or consent to sacrifice the Church.[1] On this point Jermyn's assurances that the Church was already lost, and the Queen's protestations that he would be able, later, to restore the bishops, failed to move him. He even remained proof against Henrietta's threat of retiring into a convent, though it added a keener pang to all he had yet suffered. 'This, if it fell out—which God forbid—is so destructive to all my affairs—— I say no more; my heart is too big, the rest being fitter for my thoughts than for my expression. In another way I have mentioned this to the Queen, my grief being the only thing I desire to conceal from her,'[2] he wrote to Jermyn.

In December 1646 the officers of the Scottish army offered to restore him in the teeth of both Parliaments, if he would only make the desired concession, but he refused their offer unhesitatingly, and in February of the following year the Scots recrossed the Tweed, delivering the King up to the English Parliament in return for the payment of their arrears.[3]

The Scots gone, the dissensions between the English Presbyterians and Independents, and between army and Parliament, broke out unrestrained, and as a result the

[1] Gardiner's *Civil War*, iv. p. 220. *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 261, 271.

[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 270, 3rd October 1646.

[3] Gardiner's *Civil War*, iv. p. 186.

King was seized by the army and carried off from Holmby to Newmarket. Next the army occupied London and terrorised the city. The whole year passed in quarrels between army, Parliament, and the city of London, while all three treated fruitlessly with the King. The army was inclined to be far more liberal in religious matters than were the Scots, but it was bent on substituting a strictly limited monarchy for the monarchy of the Tudors and Stuarts, which the King regarded as a scarcely less sacred trust than the Church. Also they required the sacrifice of a certain number of Royalists, and Charles, ever haunted by remorse for Strafford's fate, was resolved never again to desert a friend. 'I will end this letter with a negative direction, which is *never to abandon the protection of your friends under any pretension whatsoever*,'[1] he had written to his son a few months earlier.

In February 1648 Cromwell, exasperated by the discovery of the King's continued intrigues with the Scots, seriously thought of placing the Prince of Wales on the throne, a month later it was proposed to substitute the Duke of York, and, after his escape from captivity, there was an idea of crowning the little Duke of Gloucester.

Divisions were growing up within the army itself, Levellers were gaining strength and dissensions prevailed in army and Parliament alike, increasing the general feeling of insecurity. The country, weary of war, exhausted by heavy taxation, irritated by the suppression of all accustomed amusements and holidays, began to realise that, in exchange for an absolute monarchy, it was offered a choice between a military despotism and a corrupt, parliamentary oligarchy. There was a general feeling that peace and stability would never be found until the army was disbanded and the King restored, and a Royalist reaction swept over the country. Pressure from without had effaced the minor distinctions within the Royalist party proper, constitutionalists and

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 254, 26th August 1646.

absolutists were one; fear of the Independents joined the Presbyterians to the Royalists, both to the Scots and all to the King. Thus was made possible the Second Civil War. 1648

Scotland was divided into three parties, the Royalists led by Montrose, who had, however, been defeated and banished, and the factions of the Marquis of Argyle and the Duke of Hamilton. These last were both Presbyterian, but with this difference, that while Argyle's was the strongly clerical party, which held firmly by the Covenant, the Hamiltonians—whose only able adherent was John Maitland, Earl of Lauderdale—represented the lay nobility opposed to the tyranny of the Kirk. Both feared the establishment of a strong military power in England, and both were thoroughly dissatisfied with the conduct of affairs there, but it was the Hamiltonians only who consented to take the Royalists by the hand. They had, however, the majority in the Scottish Parliament, and were, for the moment, all-powerful. In April 1647 they sent commissioners to England secretly instructed to treat with the King, and in June of the same year Lord Dunfermline, one of their number, went to Paris to beg the Prince of Wales to come to Scotland, asserting that the English Presbyterians would rise in a body as soon as he crossed the border. In December the King, then at Carisbrooke Castle, gave his assent to the treaty known as the 'Engagement,' by which he agreed to permit the establishment of Presbyterianism for three years, with the usual reserve in favour of Episcopacy, to suppress various specified heresies, and to give security to those who had already taken the Covenant, though he refused to take it himself or to force it on any one else. The Hamiltonians promised, on their part, to issue a declaration in support of the ancient prerogative of the Crown, and to bring an invading army into England. They were to procure the disbandment of the English army, the election of a new Parliament, and the restoration of the militia to the King's control. In return

several Court offices were to be granted to Scotsmen, the towns of Berwick and Carlisle were to be held by them till the end of the war, and, failing the King himself, the Prince of Wales was to accompany their march.

Hamilton then proceeded to raise an army of which he himself was general. For his lieutenant-general he chose the Earl of Callander, an experienced soldier and a friend of Montrose, and the command of the cavalry was intrusted to Sir Thomas Middleton, 'a person of great courage and honour.'[1] Two English Cavaliers, who possessed considerable influence in the northern counties—Sir Marmaduke Langdale and Sir Philip Musgrave—promised co-operation, though they refused to take the Covenant, and a general insurrection was planned to take place in England, so soon as the Scots drew off the army northwards. Hopes were also entertained from Ireland, though, as events turned out, no party in that distracted country was able to assist the King at this juncture. The Royalist party thus presented a loose combination of Cavaliers, English and Scottish Presbyterians, and Irish Roman Catholics, all more or less scattered and disorganised, and the want of a competent leader, a definite policy, and a common enthusiasm could but end in disaster.

The arrangements for the rising were the work of the Queen and Jermyn, aided by Lady Carlisle, through whose influence the Earl of Holland was appointed Commander-in-Chief. Holland had changed sides more than once, had no military talent or constructive ability, and was not calculated to inspire confidence in any party. Consequently insurrections broke out in different parts of the country in a detached, desultory fashion, and the new model army was able to crush them in detail.

Yet at first the Royalist hopes rose high, Langdale and Musgrave successfully seized on Berwick and Carlisle, and on May 1, 1648, the Prince of Wales received a formal invitation to join Hamilton's army. He replied,

[1] Burnet's *Dukes of Hamilton*, Bk. vi. p. 48-50.

rather unexpectedly, that he would come only on the condition of being allowed the company and ministrations of his English chaplains. With this answer the Scottish lords returned to their friends, and Charles remained in France till June, when the revolt of a part of the Parliament's summer fleet to the King caused him to hasten to Holland. This fleet had been placed under the command of Colonel Rainsborough, who had been promoted over the head of Vice-Admiral Batten because he, as an Independent, enjoyed the confidence of the party in power. But the very qualities that endeared him to the army made him distasteful to the navy. Jealousy of the Independent soldiery had made the sailors Presbyterian; they witnessed the universal discontent and listened to the rumours of a Scottish invasion and a Cavalier rising with ever-growing excitement, and were at last roused to action by the escape of the young Duke of York, titular Lord High Admiral of England, from the custody of the Parliament. James of York, the King's second son, had been taken in Oxford when that city surrendered to Fairfax in June 1646, and had been placed at St. James's Palace, in the care of the Duke of Northumberland, together with his younger brother and sister, Henry, Duke of Gloucester, and the Princess Elizabeth. The King, no less anxious for James than he had been for Charles, determined that the boy's escape must somehow be effected, and confided the execution of the business to a certain Colonel Charles Bampfylde, 'a man of an active and insinuating nature,'[1] who had served in the Royalist army, but had also tampered with the Presbyterians, and possessed their confidence sufficiently to be allowed access to the park and gardens of St. James's. The Colonel at first demurred, but the King was urgent. 'I beleeve itt will be difficult,' he wrote, 'and if hee (James) miscarry in the attempt itt will be ye greatest affliction that can arrive to mee; butt I look upon James' escape as Charles' pre-

1648 April

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xi. p. 19.

servation, and nothing can content mee more, therefore bee carefull what you doe.'[1]

Thus exhorted, Bampfylde consented to do his best in the matter, and selected as his accomplice Mrs. Anne Murray, the daughter of the King's old tutor and secretary, Thomas Murray. Having gained access to the young Prince through one of the gentlemen in attendance on him, 'who was full of honour and fidelity,' Bampfylde carefully measured his height and the size of his waist with a ribbon; these measurements were then transmitted to Anne Murray, who repaired to a tailor in the city to inquire how much mohair would be needed to make a petticoat and waistcoat for a lady of the given proportions. The tailor considered the question a long time, remarking that 'he had made many gownes and suites, but he had never made any to such a person in his life, . . . meaning hee had never seene any woman of so low a stature have so big a waist.' He agreed, however, to undertake the commission, and soon finished the required garments, which were of 'a mixed mohaire of a light haire colour and black, and ye under-petticoate was scarlet.' In the meantime James had been instructed to play diligently at hide-and-seek with his brother and sister, and to hide himself so well that his guardians might become accustomed to miss him for half an hour at a time without alarm. This continued for about a fortnight, and at last, on April 20th, the fateful evening arrived. Before supper James called for the gardener and borrowed his key of the garden gates, saying something about his own being broken, and as soon as the meal was over he summoned his brother and sister to their game. Running upstairs, he locked his little dog into his sister's room, lest it should follow and betray him, locked the door into the balcony and threw away the key; he then began to descend by the backstairs. As he did so his foot slipped, and, fearful lest the noise

[1] *Autobiography of Anne Murray* (*Lady Halkett*), p. 20. Camden Society. New Series, xiii.

should have attracted attention, he ran back to his own room and took up a book, pretending to read. But all remained still and quiet, and in a few minutes he resumed his flight, and made his way through the garden into the park, treble locking all the doors behind him. At the last gate Bampfylde awaited him with a cloak and wig, which James quickly donned, and together 'they hied to Spring Gardens as gallants come to heare the nightingale.' On the other side of the gardens they entered a coach, and drove to the river-side, where they took barge and rowed down stream to a house in which Anne Murray and her maid were awaiting them. It was already after ten o'clock when they reached the house, and the Colonel had bidden Anne to fly if they had not arrived before that time, as she might be sure, in that case, the plan had miscarried. When they entered, therefore, she made no doubt that they were soldiers come to arrest her. 'But it was a pleasing disappointment,' she wrote, 'for ye first that came in was the duke, who, with much joy, I took in my armes, and gave God thankes for his safe arrivall.' The boy, impatient of her prayers and embraces, cried: 'Quickly, quickly, dress me!' And Anne speedily arrayed him in the girlish attire prepared for him. It was found to fit beautifully, 'and he looked very pretty in it.' James then partook of a meal the preparation of which had beguiled Anne's hours of waiting, after which he took to his barge again, bearing away as Anne's last gift 'a woodstreet cake, which,' says she, 'I knew he loved.' They had not gone very far when James, forgetful of his new rôle, betrayed himself by 'laying his leg upon the table, and plucking up his stocking in so unwomanish a manner' as to excite the suspicion of the barge-master. The man was with difficulty persuaded to take him as far as Gravesend, and even after his objections were overcome, the wind was so violently against them that Bampfylde himself thought of turning back. But the boy cried: 'Doe anythinge with mee, rather than lett mee go back againe,' and they at

last reached the Dutch vessel that lay in wait for them, with Sir Nicholas Armorer and other Royalists on board. Embarking in her they pretended that great haste was necessary lest one of the company should be arrested for debt, and so succeeded in getting out to sea before the Parliament could issue orders for the closing of the ports. A three hours' calm delayed them next day in the Downs, in full sight of Rainsborough's fleet, but they remained unsuspected, and on the second day, Sunday, reached Middleburg in safety. From thence James proceeded by a smaller boat to Dort, and sent Bampfylde to announce his arrival at the Hague. The Prince and Princess of Orange, his sister and brother-in-law, were delighted by the news, and hastened to greet him. The Prince met him on the river Maes, off Maesland Sluys, and conducted him to the town of Sluys, where the Princess received her brother at the door of her lodgings. 'The affectionateness of that meeting I cannot express,' says an eye-witness of it.[1]

Very soon after this event the discontented sailors began to talk of going to their 'Admiral' in Holland, and Rainsborough was ordered to join the six ships lying in the Downs and suppress the mutiny. His arrival put the final touch to the general disaffection. The sailors 'laid hold on him and such officers as they liked not, put them into the boat and sent them ashore.' The other vessels followed the example of the first, and the fleet, having been well provisioned, 'feasted and caressed' by the people of Kent, secured the castles of Deal, Sandown, and Walmer, and then sailed away for the coast of Holland. At Helvoetsluys it was joined by James, who was received with acclamation.[2]

The young Duke was at this time greatly influenced by Bampfylde, and the influence was not a good one.

[1] *Autobiography of Anne Murray* (*Lady Halkett*), pp. 20-3. *Autobiography of James II.* (edited by Clarke, 1816), i. pp. 34-9. *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. App. xlvii.

[2] *Autobiography of James II.*, i. pp. 39-43. *Clarendon, History*, xi. p. 21.

The ambitious Colonel had expected to be appointed the Duke's governor, but the Queen, as soon as she heard of her son's escape, had sent Sir John Berkeley to fill that office, during the absence, in England, of Lord Byron, to whom it properly belonged. Bampfylde deemed his place in the Duke's bedchamber an insufficient reward for his services, and bitterly resented the Queen's action, the more that Berkeley happened to be 'the man he hated of all men living.'[1] He took pains to inspire James with rebellious sentiments towards his mother and with distrust of Berkeley, whose part in the King's unfortunate attempt to escape from Hampton Court he represented as deliberately treacherous. In all this he found an easy success, and he next conceived the design of becoming, through James, paramount in the fleet. 'Having a wonderful address to the disposing of men to mutiny,' he worked upon the sailors—who had with them no officer above the rank of boatswain—to declare for the Duke of York without mention of King or Prince, and to refuse to take Berkeley on board the fleet. Falling on their knees before James, they vowed to shed their last drop of blood in his service, and entreated him to assume the office of Admiral, to which entreaty he signified his assent, subject to the approval of the King, his father. 1648 May

Unfortunately for Bampfylde, Jermyn had become possessed 'with the strange ambition' to be Lord High Admiral himself,[2] although he had no claim on the sailors' affection and was perfectly ignorant of all naval matters. He had, however, a potent argument in that he alone could obtain the necessary supplies of money, and he had also an able agent in Holland, Dr. Goffe, one of the royal chaplains. Goffe came to the fleet, insinuated himself into the confidence of the sailors, and tried to arouse in them distrust of Bampfylde. At the same time came the Presbyterian Lord Willoughby of Parham

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xi. p. 21.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 97. Hatton to Nicholas, 29th August 1648.

to Rotterdam, and James, in the mistaken idea that he would be popular with the men, appointed him Vice-Admiral, though he had never been to sea in his life before. The sailors' 'infant loyalty' began to be shaken by all these distractions, and Goffe, finding his efforts to oust James unsuccessful, urged Jermyn to send the Prince of Wales to Holland with all speed.[1]

The chief difficulty in the way of this was, of course, want of money, and Mazarin, who had promised so largely, now refused to furnish any, though the Prince's journey was 'so behoofful.'[2] Jermyn, however, managed to raise a certain sum, and with this the Prince set out, June 25, accompanied by Rupert, Culpepper, Hopton, and most of the English lords and gentlemen in Paris,[3] leaving the Queen desolate and almost destitute at St. Germains. It was at this period that she showed a little gold cup to her friend, Madame de Motteville, saying that it was all the gold she owned in the world. Her jewels she had pawned to provide money for the English rising, and she protested that her trouble had been aggravated by the fact that her son's people had asked for money at their departure and she had had none to give.[4]

It had been the King's express command that, whenever the Prince left France, he should summon the Chancellor to attend on him. Accordingly letters had been sent to Jersey, requiring Hyde's attendance at St. Germains by a certain date. But that date was past before the letters reached their destination, nor was the Chancellor in condition to start at a moment's notice. 'You will easily believe that a man who has not had a boot on these two years—nor in truth hath a boot to put on—cannot in a moment put himself into an equipage for such a journey,' he wrote to Jermyn. Nor were boots the only thing he lacked; he needed also, he asserted,

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xi. pp. 32-4. [2] *Ibid.* p. 31.
[3] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 95. *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxi. fol. 141.
[4] *De Motteville*, ii. p. 414.

'such an honest habit that you may look upon me without laughing at St. Germains.' Fortunately Jermyn had sent him a little money, and he concluded gratefully: 'I thank you for the sense you have of my beggary . . . which, I confess, is so notorious that, without your supply, I could as well have walked to St. Germains afoot as bear my own charges thither.'[1] 1648 June

The boots and 'habit' obtained, Hyde took ship for Normandy and hastened to Caen, where he learnt that his old friends the Earl of Bristol, Lord Cottington, the Lord High Treasurer of England, and Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State, were all at Rouen. Thither he went, and, hearing that the Prince had already gone to Calais, he resolved to await further orders at Rouen, where he and his friends 'lived very decently together,' until the news of the Prince's departure for Holland caused them to remove to Dieppe.[2]

In point of fact those about the Prince desired nothing less than the company of his father's old friends and councillors. The Queen and Jermyn, bent on a coalition with the Presbyterians, had instructed Culpepper and Sir Robert Long, Charles's secretary, to keep the Prince 'steady and fast to that dependence.'[3] These two saw clearly enough that the firm churchmanship of Hyde and Nicholas would be an obstacle to their design, and therefore Culpepper pressed on for Holland with all possible haste; Lord Hatton, detecting his scheme, urged delay at Calais until the councillors could come up with them, Culpepper retorted hotly 'that he hoped no man would think it fit Prince Charles should wait on them, and though Charles supported Hatton, it was decided that the councillors could follow later. Hopton then desired that they should be directed by letter to do so, but Long opposed the motion 'with rough and indecent language,' and Culpepper maintained that they were too old and infirm to undertake the journey. Only when it was

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxi. fol. 120, 16th June 1648.
[2] *Clarendon, History*, xi. p. 23. [3] *Ibid.* p. 36.

certain that the fleet would sail before they could possibly arrive, were the letters sent. 'And yett I must tell you, to the sweete yonge Prince himself you would have found a very hearty welcome,' protested Hatton.[1]

But Jermyn just then ruled supreme, insomuch that Sir William Davenant declared openly that those about the Prince attended solely at that lord's pleasure. His only rival was Prince Rupert, who hated Culpepper, and was as hostile to the Presbyterian policy as Hyde could have desired. But, though Rupert's personal influence with his young cousin was still considerable, his prestige was no longer what it had been, and he could do no more than defeat Jermyn's agents on some minor points.[2] About July 9th Charles left Calais without the councillors and sailed straight for Helvoetsluys, where he was enthusiastically welcomed by the fleet.

His arrival restored the sailors' good-humour, but it was evident that nothing but action would preserve it, and Charles resolved to lose no time in putting to sea. One of his motives for haste had been his fear 'lest his brother should be in action before him,'[3] and Culpepper had taken pains to foment this jealousy and to represent the young Duke as the author of all the distractions in the fleet. The Prince, therefore, on assuming the command, ordered James to retire to the Hague, alleging, reasonably enough, that it was inexpedient to risk both their lives on the same venture. But James, who regarded the fleet as his special province, was bitterly disappointed, and the incident created a feeling of distrust and jealousy between the brothers which endured till the Restoration.[4] Lord Willoughby, James's Vice-Admiral, was less easily disposed of, for his removal would have given offence to the Presbyterians, and his incompetence had therefore to be tolerated. Provisions

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 91-3. Hatton to Nicholas, 29th August 1648.
[2] *Ibid.* i. p. 96.
[3] *Clarendon, History*, xi. p. 32.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 35. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 97.

1648 July-August

were supplied by the generosity of the Prince of Orange, who had brought his wife to meet and welcome her eldest brother, and now victualled the fleet for three months. On July 16th the Prince of Wales wrote to Hamilton protesting his earnest desire to join him as soon as he received a satisfactory reply to his last message. 'In the meantime,' he added, 'wee intend to imploy ourselves att sea aboard the fleete as the best expedient wee can for the present make use of to oppose the common enemy both to you and to us.'[1] On the following day he issued a declaration that he took arms to restore the King, disband the army, procure an act of oblivion, and to settle religion according to the Engagement between the King and the Scots.[2]

On July 22nd the Prince, sailing for the Downs, was forced by contrary winds into Yarmouth Roads, 'to the great terror and amazement of town and country.' Tumults arose among the sailors on shore, and 'a rude multitude' in the town opposed the entrance of Parliamentary troops. But Charles had no land forces to send to their aid and was obliged to content himself with obtaining supplies, after which he sailed again for the Downs.[3] There he learnt that though Walmer Castle was lost, those of Deal and Sandown still held out for the King, and the garrison of Deal, already hard pressed, promised 'to hold out to the utmost extremity and live by bread and water' if only the fleet would give them a supply of bread and take off their sick and wounded. But valuable time was lost by irresolution, and every day the forces of the foe drew closer round the ill-fated castle, until, on the night of August 14th, a young lieutenant, reproaching his superiors with cowardice, volunteered to do the work himself. But in the darkness he failed to find the right entrance to the castle, the tide was gone out too far for the ships to ride under the walls, and he

[1] *Hamilton Papers*, i. p. 232, 16th-26th July 1648.
[2] Gardiner's *Civil War*, iv. p. 171.
[3] *Domestic State Papers*, Public Record Office, Charles I., DXVI. p. 72.

1648 September

was obliged to land, whereupon his small force was charged and scattered by eight hundred horse of the enemy. One officer was killed, another taken prisoner, and, as no further attempt to relieve the castle was possible, it was obliged to surrender a fortnight later, lost, as Dr. Earles confessed, 'by our own careless stupidity.' Ten days later Sandown Castle also capitulated, and the whole affair proved a serious 'disreputation' to the Royalist fleet.[1]

In the meantime Charles had been joined by Batten, the discontented vice-admiral of the Parliament, who brought over with him one of its best ships, the *Constant Warwick*. He was graciously received, knighted, and appointed rear-admiral of the Royalist fleet, in which capacity Charles hoped he might be able to counterbalance the inexperience of Willoughby. The fleet now consisted of eleven vessels, and, as usual, counsels were divided. Batten was eager to sail straight for Scotland, others pressed the relief of Colchester, besieged by Fairfax, and Rupert desired to go to the Isle of Wight, where the King was imprisoned. This last plan had the approval of the King himself, and he sent Colonel Will Legge to urge its adoption, 'But it was no more listened to or regarded than if a dog had been sent to them.'[2] The sailors wished to hover about the Thames, capture returning merchantmen, and prevent the Earl of Warwick from getting out the Parliamentary fleet by sinking boats in the Medway. These tactics were finally resolved on, and Charles proceeded to block the mouth of the Thames, where many valuable prizes fell into his hands, in particular a vessel laden with cloth, belonging to the Merchant Adventurers, and valued at £20,000. The advantage of all this was lost by the policy of conciliation which Culpepper thought it wise to pursue. 'I can tell you that, having possessed ourselves of prizes worth £120,000, we have very courteously lost them

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxi. fol. 242, 18th September 1648.
[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 416, 24th September 1648.

all and only reserved to ourselves about £30,000, a course we thought ourselves very wise in, though—for aught I can perceive—men as wise as ourselves laugh at us,' wrote Dr. Stewart.[1]

The seizure of the cloth ship caused consternation in the city of London, which immediately petitioned Parliament for the King's release and a cessation of arms. The Parliament, naturally, rejected the petition, but a committee of citizens was allowed to seek the Prince of Wales in order to treat for the restoration of their property. These citizens were the bearers of letters from many believed to be well affected to the King, and one, a Mr. Low, brought messages from Lady Carlisle, assuring Charles of the good inclination of the city, and urging him to avoid all causes of irritation. He thereupon wrote to the Common Council, dwelling much on his affection for the city, and calling upon the Londoners to join him in delivering his father and restoring peace. He added a request for a loan of £20,000, which he promised to repay in better times; about £12,000 was sent to him, and in return he released the valuable prize, to the deep annoyance of many of his followers, who believed, not without reason, that a serious interruption to trade would have done more for the loyalty of the city than any amount of cajolery and conciliation. 'Declarations and epistling took up our time to gett money from the city and divide them from the Parliament, but to no effect but hastening our own ruin,' they said bitterly, and the blame of all was thrown on Culpepper, 'our single counsellor, for 'tis conceived His Highness hath but one, and all the rest are but committee-men.'[2]

Attempts to win over Warwick himself proved equally abortive. To the Prince's letter he only replied by a humble entreaty that Charles would confide his person to the care of the Parliament. The persuasions of

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxi. fol. 241, 17th September 1648.
[2] *Ibid.* xxxi. fol. 242.

William Crofts, a connection of Warwick by marriage, whom Charles next sent, worked no better effect, and the Parliamentary admiral continued to busy himself with weeding out the disaffected and remanning his fleet.

In the midst of all these events came the Earl of Lauderdale into the Downs, bearing the long-expected answer to Charles's last message to the Scots. He was a person of strangely uncouth appearance, with masses of red hair 'oddly hanging about him,' and of rough, boisterous manners. The young Duke of Buckingham characterised him as 'a man of blundering understanding,' but he was in reality possessed of some ability, much learning, a tenacious memory, and considerable eloquence.[1]

Charles received him on board the *Constant Reformation*, where he also found Rupert, Buckingham, and the Lords Brentford, Percy, Culpepper, Hopton, Wentworth, Wilmot, Witherington, and Gerard. With the young Prince he was favourably impressed. 'The great opinion I have of his power I shall leave till meeting,' he wrote to the Earl of Lanerick, Hamilton's brother, 'and then I am confident your lordship will be of my opinion when you see his Highness, that we are like to be very happy in him.'[2]

Cautiously and fragmentarily he revealed his instructions to Charles. First he delivered an invitation to the Prince to join the Scottish army, now entering England, promising him 'honour, freedom, and safety' for his person. This Charles received 'with much gallantrie' and an evident desire to be in action. Then came the conditions. He was to bring neither chaplain nor prayer-book, and to use exclusively the Presbyterian form of worship. To this Charles demurred and expressed a desire to send and seek his father's orders. But Lauderdale roughly retorted that delay would be fatal and

[1] *Burnet*, i. p. 185.

[2] *Hamilton Papers*, p. 238. Lauderdale to Lanerick, 10th August 1648.

that if any were made he would go straight back to Scotland without any answer at all. Charles then conceded the point, whereupon he was presented with two more papers, the one desiring him to order his fleet to cruise off the coast of Scotland, under the direction of the Committee of Estates; the second prohibiting him from bringing with him Digby, Montrose, Crawford, and one or two other faithful Royalists.[1] In Lauderdale's own instructions the names of Rupert and Maurice headed the list of the proscribed, but Charles so firmly forbade Lauderdale to include them in his written demands that he yielded and omitted their names. Charles then granted the conditions as they stood, and added a private assurance that Rupert would not come without the consent of the Scots, which he entreated Lauderdale to obtain. Lord Willoughby, himself a Presbyterian, added his entreaties to those of the Prince, and Lauderdale confessed himself favourably impressed with the terrible Rupert, who had, he discovered, a great personal influence with Charles. Rupert was less taken with Lauderdale and had a very poor opinion of the whole affair, though he 'carried himself very handsomely' towards the Scottish envoy. Culpepper and Willoughby, of course, forwarded the Scottish interest as much as possible, as did also Percy and Wilmot, but Hopton and Gerard protested earnestly against the religious concessions. All was, however, decided in Lauderdale's favour and Charles announced his intention of sailing for Berwick, after a brief but necessary delay for victualling in Holland.[2]

Then came the turn of the 'Anti-Scottists.' The sailors, 'in mutinous discontent,' crowded on to the upper deck and 'passionately by words' implored their Prince not to desert them, but to allow them to attack Warwick in the Lee Roads.[3] Charles argued with them,

[1] *Hamilton Papers*, pp. 242-3. Lauderdale to Prince, 17th, 18th August 1648.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 244-9. Lauderdale to Lanerick, 19th, 20th August 1648.

[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxi. fol. 242.

but in vain; they protested that most of Warwick's fleet would desert to them, that it was ill-manned, and would be easily destroyed. 'Lett his Highness but go with us into the Lee road and stay there but twenty-four hours,' they cried; 'then we will obey his commands and follow him any whither.' And they cursed Culpepper and Lauderdale, threatening to throw them both into the sea.[1] Charles, actuated more by a habit of obedience to his mother than by any personal love of the Scots, argued and entreated until at last his own men professed themselves 'content, after a sort,' to go to Holland. Then, on Monday, August 28th, he set sail, bearing first towards the Lee Roads, but, as darkness fell, steering out to sea. At dawn the other ships saw the course he was taking, and four of the largest immediately made for the river, in defiance of their officers' commands. Charles thereupon cast anchor and called a council at which it was decided that he should follow the rebellious vessels, provided that the sailors would 'covenant' not to give him up to any person whatsoever. The men retorted that they had had already 'too much covenant,' but that they would swear to be true to God, King Charles, and the Prince. With this the councillors professed themselves satisfied, and it was resolved to engage with Warwick's fleet. Whereupon Lauderdale, who was 'a-weary of wagging at sea,'[2] and had no desire to be involved in a mere Royalist adventure, took his departure for Holland.

Warwick's fleet numbered only thirteen or fourteen sail, and as soon as it was sighted the Royalists, who boasted eleven men-of-war and four merchantmen, set on all sail and gave chase. The pursuit lasted six hours, and at nightfall the Royalist vice-admiral anchored a mile before her consorts and one and a half miles distant from the foe. It was not until noon of the following day that the tide again served the Royalists,

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxi. fol. 242. *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 415.
[2] *Hamilton Papers*, p. 253. Lauderdale to Lanerick, 21st August 1648.

and enabled them to resume the chase. Warwick retreated as before, but by three o'clock the two fleets were within range of one another, to the great joy of the Royalists. The decks were cleared for action, and both sailors and officers 'beseeched the Prince to go into the hold to preserve himself.' Charles, who was no coward and had all a boy's eagerness to see the fight, replied that 'that could not preserve his honour, which was dearer to him than his life, and that at the main-mast on the deck he would take his fortune with them.' This reply so won the affection of the sailors that he was henceforth 'master of their very souls.' But their hopes were quickly dashed. Just as the two vice-admirals were about to engage, a sudden wind swept the fleets violently asunder, the advance of the Royalists became impossible, and Warwick, having the wind, was able to avoid the encounter.

Once more Charles cast anchor and called a council, as a result of which Culpepper and Hopton next morning informed the angry crews 'with such cheer and joy as men after a glorious victory,' that they must retreat and, if possible, draw Warwick out to sea, since a fight amidst the shoals would be over-dangerous. As provisions were now wofully short and the supply of water quite run out, the sailors yielded to persuasion, cherishing still the hope that they might fall in with the Portsmouth fleet by the way.

The retreat began leisurely with Warwick following at a discreet distance, and between six and seven in the evening lights were sighted. Rupert, who was standing on the deck of the *Constant Reformation*, judged them to belong to the Portsmouth fleet, and ordered the master to steer for them. But Batten, in some agitation, declared that the vessels sighted could be nothing more than a fleet of collier boats, and protested vehemently against the change of course. 'Sir!' he cried to the Prince of Wales, 'whither are we steering? Will you have him run out of the way for every collier that he sees?'

Rupert was furious, but Batten, as an experienced sailor, prevailed at the expense of his reputation for courage.

During the night the *Swallow* fell in amongst the Portsmouth fleet, hailed it, and learnt that it was waiting for the tide to join Warwick in the river. The *Swallow's* crew were anxious to fight, but the officers managed to persuade them that it would be 'madness' to attack alone; so they held on their course, and after a hot race with Warwick for possession of the harbour, cast anchor at Helvoetsluys on Friday, September 1st-11th. 'And there we are, I thank God, and if ever they get me into their sea-voyages again I am very much mistaken,' was the pious conclusion of Secretary Long's narrative of the expedition.[1]

Leaving the fleet at Helvoetsluys the Prince proceeded to the Hague, where he was given a cordial reception by the Dutch. He made his entry into the capital in state, was lodged in the house reserved for foreign ambassadors, and, at his formal audience with the States-General, was received with royal honours. Further he was granted an allowance of one thousand guilders a day for ten days, with an intimation that at the expiration of that time he must 'shift for himself,'[2] since the Provincial States of Holland had refused to sanction the proposal of the States-General to continue the pension at the reduced rate of three hundred guilders a day. Fortunately for Charles he had a warm friend in the young Stadtholder, William II. of Orange, who invited him to pass the winter beneath his roof, protesting sincere regret that he could do no more. But his own funds were low, he was not on the best terms with the States, and they were firmly bent on neutrality, more firmly now than ever, since all hopes from the English rising and the Scottish invasion were already at an end.[3]

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxi. fol. 242. *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 414-16. *Rupert Papers*, Warburton, iii. pp. 249-53.

[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 415, 24th September 1648.

[3] Groen van Prinsterer, *Archives de la Maison d'Orange*, 2nd series, vol. iv. pp. 267-9. *Carte MSS.*, lxiii. fol. 562, 2nd-12th December 1648.

1648 May-August

Everywhere the Royalist schemes had ended in dismal failure. In May the Welsh had been overthrown at St. Fagan's, and in July their last stronghold—Pembroke Castle—was wrested from them. In Kent an unauthorised insurrection had ruined the designs of Lord Holland. The Earl of Norwich gallantly attempted to control it, but he had no military talent, and his untrained forces fell an easy prey to Fairfax. With a faithful few he fled to Essex, where he was joined by the Royalists of that county, among whom were Charles Lucas and George Lisle. They threw themselves into Colchester on June 12th, and after a terrible siege, of which the history is well known, surrendered, August 27th, to Fairfax, whose conduct on that occasion stained his formerly fair reputation. Holland was not more successful. He had hoped to secure the city of London, but was forced to take the field prematurely on July 4th. The city failed to rise, and Holland, with the young Duke of Buckingham, was completely routed three days later by Livesey at Kingston-on-Thames. The skirmish is chiefly remembered for the death of Buckingham's brother, Francis Villiers, 'a youth of rare beauty and comeliness of person.' The boy's horse was killed under him, and he thereupon set his back against an elm-tree, which stood in the midst of a hedge, refused all offers of quarter with the gallant pride of his nineteen years, and fought desperately to the end. He received nine wounds and only succumbed at last to a cowardly blow dealt him from behind the hedge. Then he fell, leaving for all time a pathetic memory of personal beauty and boyish gallantry. Yet who shall say he was not happy in his death? And well might it have been for Buckingham had he died that day beside his brother. But he escaped in safety to the Royalist fleet and lived to earn for himself a less enviable reputation. Holland was taken at St. Neot's, July 10th, and subsequently executed.[1]

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xi. p. 104. Gardiner, *Civil War*, iv. p. 160. Jesse's *Court of England*, iii. p. 67.

But most fatal of all was the disaster that befell Hamilton's Scottish army. It had entered England on July 8th, and Lambert slowly fell back before it, waiting to be joined by Cromwell. Hamilton was no general, and found himself at the mercy of Callander, who displayed an ignorant obstinacy. Sir George Monroe, leader of the contingent from Ireland, refused to act with Callander and hung behind the main body, and Langdale's English Cavaliers, who led the van, were the only members of the expedition who acquitted themselves well. After a straggling, unsoldierly march through Lancashire, the Scots were confronted by the combined forces of Cromwell and Lambert near Preston, on August 17th. Langdale and his men bore the brunt of the battle, fighting, as their foes confessed, like heroes, but Callander left them unsupported. Hamilton was at least a gentleman, and he joined Langdale in person, refusing to desert him as long as he held the field, but to no avail. The rout was complete, the slaughter terrible, Langdale and Hamilton were taken, Callander and Monroe fled, the whole Scottish army capitulated, and the prisoners were sold as slaves to the planters of Virginia and Barbadoes.[1] Their terrible fate did not win them much sympathy from their English allies. 'It is a wonderful thing and God's just judgment that those that sold their King not two years ago for £200,000 should now be sold for 2s. a piece to be carried to new Plantations. You will think it strange that men should be sold in England, but so it is, I assure you,' commented one writer calmly.[2] Yet even those who least loved the Scots had been forced to recognise that they were 'the only string to our bow,' and their 'miraculous defeat' threw the Royalists into the utmost consternation, 'not so much to see them beaten, for 'tis thought they are mortal, but *so* beaten!'[3]

[1] Burnet's *Dukes of Hamilton*, vi. pp. 48-60. *Civil War*, iv. pp. 180-93. *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 159-62.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 177, 23rd October 1648.

[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 416, 24th September 1648.

For the moment they were wholly lost to the royal cause. Such as could escape had fled northwards, and the Committee of Estates, thinking to preserve Scotland by the desertion of her English allies, forbade any of the latter to cross the border. Cromwell nevertheless pushed on into Scotland, and Argyle accepted him temporarily as an ally, profiting by his presence to complete the overthrow of the Hamiltonians. They had been already condemned by the General Assembly of the Kirk for daring to aid an uncovenanted king, and now they were forced to resign all share in the government and all claim to offices of trust. Argyle and his party constituted themselves into a new Committee of Estates,[1] and on 23rd January they passed the Act of Classes, which divided the Engagers into three classes, according to their degrees of guilt, and excluded them from Parliament and office—for life, for ten, and for five years respectively. All were to remain under disabilities until they had given satisfaction for their offences. The news of all these disasters was broken to Charles by the Prince of Orange on his arrival at the Hague, and it was therefore not without surprise that he found Lauderdale still awaiting him and, apparently, as confident as ever. 1648 August

A more welcome addition to his following were the councillors, Hyde and Cottington, who had at last made their way to Holland after various unpleasant adventures, including capture by Ostend pirates and the consequent loss of all they possessed—money, clothes, and linen.[2] Charles at once informed them of all that had passed between him and the Scots, and called Lauderdale to lay his proposals before the council board on the morning of September 8th-18th.

Lauderdale came and, still unabashed, read his commission from the Scottish Parliament, then the letter to the Prince by which Charles was urged to hasten to Hamilton's army, and finally the conditions on which

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 180, 20th October 1648.
[2] *Clarendon, Life*, i. pp. 249-50.

1648 September

Charles would be received. Having finished, he sat still in his chair until requested to withdraw, that his propositions might be considered. He retorted that the English council had no right to discuss the affairs of Scotland, whereupon Hyde, waxing wrathful, told him that he at least had no desire to conceal from him his opinion that 'all he proposed was very unreasonable.' Lauderdale then entered a formal protest that his business concerned the Prince alone, and withdrew 'with indecency enough.' Charles then informed the council of Hamilton's defeat, and adjourned the meeting till the following day in order to see whether Lauderdale would refer to the disaster. But he appeared again 'with the same confidence and the same importunity.' When asked if he had not heard the news, he answered lightly that he had heard a rumour, but hoped it was not true, and that, in any case, it ought to make no difference to the plans of the Prince. Charles's presence in Scotland would soon raise a new army, and his refusal to come would prove 'that he had little zeal for the liberty of his father and as little for his own interest.'[1]

But the reflection that Argyle would now dominate Scotland, and the news that Cromwell had marched into that country, did not tempt Charles to go thither; and Lauderdale, after a few weeks, conceived that his private concerns required his presence at home, and departed for Scotland, having, probably, a private assurance of his personal safety from Argyle.[2]

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xi. pp. 87-90.

[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 200, 11th-21st January 1649.

CHAPTER IV

Charles in Holland—Divisions in the Council—Rupert and the Fleet —State of Ireland—Illness of Charles—Christmas at the Hague—Rumours of the King's Trial—Efforts of Charles to save him—Horror at the King's Death—The War of the Fronde—The Queen's Sufferings—James goes to Paris—Effect of the King's Death on the Queen.

THE position of Charles in Holland was anything but hopeful. The fleet had arrived there 'full of anger, hatred, and disdain';[1] the sailors were mutinying for pay, the Prince's personal following was factious and poverty-stricken, the council disunited and held in no respect, while the restless intriguing of Bampfylde and 'the ambitious and unquiet humour' of Sir John Berkeley added to the confusion. 1648 September

Money was urgently needed both to pay the sailors and revictual the ships; and the bitter feeling engendered by the mismanagement of the whole affair made council meetings stormy and even private conversation dangerous. The policy that dictated the surrender of so many prizes to their owners had proved unproductive of good, and was now called treachery and corruption. The prizes that remained were already heavily charged with debts; in particular, Lady Carlisle claimed the value of a pearl necklace—£15,000, which she had sold to supply Lord Holland with funds, and her brother, Lord Percy, insisted that she must be repaid. Worst of all, there was no choice of market, and a timely warning from the Prince of Orange that the States were debating what course to pursue should the English Parliament lay claim to the

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxi. fol. 242.

prizes, caused the sales to be made hurriedly and at a disadvantage. Long, who conducted the business, was consequently exposed 'to the importunity and insolence of all necessitous persons, when he could satisfy none.'[1]

Moreover, Rupert complained fiercely that there had been no attempt to rescue the King, and accused Batten of cowardice in having prevented the fight in the river—which the change of wind had really made impossible—and in having suffered the Portsmouth fleet to pass unmolested in the night. Calmer judgments saw reason even in this, since the noise of combat might have drawn Warwick to the scene of action, but it was generally agreed that Batten had taken too much upon himself, and Rupert was supported by 'the clamour of the seamen.'[2]

Of all these things Hyde and Cottington were informed by Rupert himself within a few hours of their arrival at the Hague, and they, as the Palatine expected, threw all their weight on the side of the 'Anti-Scotists.'

The day of Culpepper and Long had come and gone; old mistakes were remembered, old stories told against them, and the unfortunate Culpepper, 'having some infirmities and a multitude of enemies, was never absolved from anything of which any man accused him,' while Long's love of money was so notorious that suspicion only too easily attached to him.[3] Secretary Nicholas threw out bitter insinuations concerning 'hot brains who have so much in their fancies as how to advance their private fortunes and to compass their ambitious and covetous designs,' adding, in the same sentence, 'If it be well considered, none of the King's affairs which have been wholly left to the conduct of my Lord Culpepper have been managed with any advantage to His Majesty.'[4] 'Great distractions'[5] reigned in the council, and the enmity between Rupert and Culpepper culminated at

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xi. p. 138. [2] *Ibid.* p. 84.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 82. [4] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 107, 287, 315.
[5] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 167.

last in a challenge delivered at the very council board; the duel was, however, prevented by the intervention of the Prince of Wales.[1] 1648 September-December

The situation was rendered the more critical by the proximity of Warwick, who had anchored at Helvoetsluys, within full view of the Royalist fleet. He had been forbidden by the States to proceed to hostilities, but he spared no pains to win back his deserted vessels by fair means or foul. His summons to Willoughby to take down the royal standard and return to the obedience of the Parliament naturally made no impression, and he next attempted to win over the common sailors by sending his own men to talk with them ashore, and by 'casting papers amongst them of large offers and promises of pardon and indemnity.'[2] His efforts in this direction met with some success, several sailors deserted to him, and the *Constant Warwick* stole away to rejoin him in the night. It seemed that unless strong measures were taken, the whole of the Royalist fleet would be lost. Batten, who was intensely disliked by the sailors, soon wearied of the whole business and returned, with Charles's permission, to England. Willoughby was equally weary of his charge, and, though not actually unpopular, had no authority among the men, who, discontented and mutinous, heeded no officer at all. To make matters worse, the Prince of Wales fell ill of the smallpox, while every day the necessity of putting to sea became more pressing, not only to content the sailors, but because the probable action of the States, in the case of the Parliament demanding the restoration of the ships, was still doubtful.

In this dilemma the council turned to the young Duke of York, from whose train Bampfylde had been removed, though the Duke continued to supply his needs when possible, in gratitude for his former services.[3] Outwardly James was perfectly submissive to his brother's authority,

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 191-2. [2] *Ibid.* p. 180.
[3] *Memoirs of James II.*, i. p. 44.

but inwardly he was still resentful of his summary dismissal from the fleet, and he could not forgive the councillors to whom he attributed his downfall. When, therefore, they requested him to go to Helvoetsluys, during the Prince's illness, and exert himself to please and pacify the sailors, he refused absolutely, asserting that the proposal was a mere plot to get him surrendered to the Parliament.

'So unpleasant and uncomfortable a province had those persons who, being of the King's council, served both with great fidelity,' complained Hyde, 'everybody who was unsatisfied—and no one was satisfied—aspersing them, or some of them, in such a manner as touched the honour of the rest, and reflected most on the Prince's own honour and service.'[1]

Such was the 'melancholic and perplexed' condition of affairs when Rupert volunteered to take over the command of the fleet and sail with it to Ireland, where the Marquis of Ormonde still stood firm for the King. This offer was hailed with relief by Charles and by most of the council, and Rupert hastened to Helvoetsluys, where he was joyfully received by the sailors. His magnetic influence and unwearied industry soon wrought a radical change in the conduct and disposition of the crews. By his personal care and diligent labours loyal officers were distributed through all the vessels, mutiny was quelled, good-humour, order, and discipline were restored, the fleet was revictualled, the sailors were paid, and in January 1649 Rupert was able to sail for Ireland, 'making notable work along the coast.'[2]

Though Ireland now seemed the last hope of the Royalists, that unhappy country was in truth in a desperate condition. Ever since his acceptance of the Lord-Lieutenancy, in 1643, Ormonde's life had been 'one perpetual vexation.' He had to contend with the 'mere Irish'

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xi. p. 141. *Carte MSS.*, xxii. fol. 647.

[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 199, 211. *Rupert, Prince Palatine*, pp. 226-32.

Catholics, who really sought the overthrow of the English supremacy, with the Irish-English of the Pale, also Catholic, who desired only religious liberty, and with the Protestant forces of England and Scotland, sent over by the respective Parliaments to reconquer Ireland. The presence of the Papal Nuncio, Rinnucini, Archbishop of Fermo; of the Spanish agent, Diego de la Torre; of the Earl of Glamorgan, invested with independent powers by the King, though he was instructed, it is true, to rely on Ormonde's advice; and the Queen's negotiations with the Pope, did not tend to simplify his task. 1646-1647

Further complications followed the King's captivity, for he contrived to send word to Ormonde secretly that he knew only what his enemies chose to tell him, and that all commands issued in his name must be ignored, and orders taken from the Queen and Prince only.[1]

But, in spite of all difficulties, Ormonde succeeded in concluding a peace with the Irish confederates, which he published July 30th, 1646. The Nuncio, however, condemned it as impious because it did not give sufficient satisfaction to the Roman Catholics as regarded religion, and all towns wherein it was proclaimed were interdicted. Riots ensued, Owen O'Neil, leader of the Celtic Irish of Ulster, declared for the clerical party; Preston, who commanded the confederate forces of Leinster, wavered, but finally did likewise. All members of the Supreme Council who were inclined to the peace were arrested, and the clergy erected a new Supreme Council of their own choosing. Ormonde struggled desperately for several months, then, finding that he must choose between Spain, the Pope, and the English Parliament, he surrendered the sword of office to the Parliamentary commissioners, 28th July 1647, and joined the Queen in France.

The victories of the English generals in Ireland soon showed the confederates their mistake, and in the following year a movement took place which closely resembled the affair of the Engagement in Scotland. As Hamilton

[1] Carte's *Ormonde*, vi. pp. 415-17.

1648 October-November

and Lauderdale had revolted against the tyranny of the Presbyterian ministers, so the Lords Clanricarde, Muskerry, and others revolted against the tyranny of the Roman clergy, and as Argyle had clung to the Kirk and the ministers, so Lord Antrim clung to the Nuncio and the bishops.

The Queen saw new hope in this revolt against clerical interference with politics, and reappointed Ormonde to the Lord-Lieutenancy, raising £30,000 for him by the sale of her jewels. At the same time Murrough O'Brien, Lord Inchiquin, who had fought savagely for the English Parliament in Munster, veered round to the Royalists, but the Nuncio rejected the alliance of a man so stained with blood and sacrilege, and excommunicated all who joined with him. Thus arose new dissensions: O'Neil remained faithful to the Nuncio; Preston, Taafe, Muskerry, and Clanricarde declared for the Lord-Lieutenant; and in October 1648 Ormonde landed at Cork, and took up again the hopeless task of striving to unite all parties in the King's service.

For such a task no one could have been better chosen. Ormonde had been brought up as a ward of the Crown, and was himself a faithful member of the English Church, but all his relations and most of his friends were of the Roman communion. His personal honour was of the purest, his patience infinite, his loyalty unalterable, but he lacked the brilliant talents that had enabled Montrose to unite the most incongruous elements and to raise a conquering army out of the most unpromising material in the Scottish Highlands.

Yet on Ireland the Queen had fixed her hopes, and in November 1648 she seriously thought of going thither in the company of her son, the more that Ormonde and the Irish themselves seemed to desire the Prince's presence. In deference to Ormonde's request that his afflicted and impoverished country might not be burdened with a royal train larger than absolute necessity demanded, she dismissed her guards and proceeded to 'lessen her family,'

directing her son to do the same. Also she advised him to hasten to Jersey in order to keep open communication with Ireland.[1] But in November the Prince of Wales was too ill to leave Holland, and soon sinister rumours of the King's danger changed the Queen's plans altogether. She abandoned the idea of going to Ireland, and wrote a pathetic letter to the English Parliament entreating permission to join her 'dearest lord, the King,' that she might console him in his misfortunes, and 'be near him in the uttermost extremity.'[2] But the letter was tossed contemptuously aside, and remained unopened until March 1682, more than thirty-three years later. 1648 December

Charles remained at the Hague, which he probably found more amusing than Jersey, and where he had no lack of cheerful company. By Christmas he had recovered his health, and his brother and sister were able to return to the Hague from Teyling, where they had taken refuge from infection in the house of the Baron van Heenvliet. Notwithstanding extreme poverty and an ever-growing anxiety, the festive season passed gaily at the Hague, where a large and merry family party was assembled. There were the young Prince and Princess of Orange, the Dowager-Princess with her many daughters, the lively Queen of Bohemia, Elizabeth Stuart, aunt of the English princes, and their Palatine cousins, her children. Of these last Rupert and Maurice were the best known to Charles and James; but there were also present Philip, the youngest brother, and the four Palatine princesses, Elizabeth, Louise, Henriette, and Sophie. As the whole family was remarkable for good looks, a brilliant wit, and an *esprit* which no misfortunes could quench, there was no want of gaiety among them, and the youngest, handsomest, and liveliest princess, who was just the same age as Charles himself, made a considerable impression upon her cousin.

But Charles had also less innocent society, and it was

[1] *Carte MSS.*, fols. 402, 647. *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 186-7.

[2] Cary's *Memorials*, ii. pp. 101-2.

at this time that he made the acquaintance of Lucy Walter, more commonly known as Mrs. Barlow. Though she came of a good Welsh family, which had ruined itself for the King, Lucy Walter was living at the Hague as the mistress of Colonel Robert Sidney when Charles came thither in September 1648. Evelyn, who saw her a year later, described her as 'a browne, beautiful, bold, but insipid creature,' and James, while he admitted her 'very handsome,' declared that she lacked wit. But her beauty sufficed to captivate Charles, and Sidney suffered her to leave him without protest.[1] On the 9th of April 1649 she gave birth to a son whom Charles acknowledged as his own. The boy, destined to become famous as the unfortunate Duke of Monmouth, was christened James, given the surname of Crofts, and established at Rotterdam in the care of an English nurse.[2] The mother from the first took care to spread the rumour that she was the King's wife, and many people believed that the marriage had taken place at Liége, but proofs were lacking, and Charles himself always denied it. He subsequently renounced his mistress altogether in consequence of the evil life she had led during his absence in Scotland, and though she followed him to Paris in 1651 and made great efforts to win him back, she failed signally. He continued to support her, however, for the sake of the child; and from that time, until her death in 1658, she contrived to be a constant source of vexation to Charles and of scandal to his adherents.[3]

Following close on the Christmas gaieties came the news of the King's trial, and Charles immediately sought an audience of the States-General to entreat their interposition. He was accompanied by four or five of his own council, and was received at the door and conducted upstairs by the whole body of the assembled States. When the usual compliments had passed, he bade Sir

[1] Althorp, *Memoirs*, preface. Evelyn's *Diary*, 18th May 1649. *Macpherson Papers*, i. p. 76.

[2] *Echard*, ii. p. 668.

[3] Fea, *King Monmouth*, pp. 1-22.

William Boswell deliver a paper, which set forth the perilous condition of the King, and entreated the active aid of the States. As surety for the fulfilment of any conditions imposed by the rebels Charles offered the surrender of his own person. The States replied with assurances of their sympathy, and promised to send an ambassador extraordinary to England, instructed by the Prince himself. This was done, but the English Parliament deferred the ambassador's audience until the trial was over, and, as the States would not engage actively in the quarrel, their envoy, though 'very loud' in the King's cause, availed nothing.[1] 1649 January

Within a day or two of his interview with the States, Charles wrote to Mazarin and to the Queen-Regent of France, appealing for their support, and warning them that the English Parliament was 'setting an example dangerous to all other princes.' Henrietta joined her voice to that of her son, and prevailed with France to publish a declaration of her 'detestation' of the proceedings, vowing 'a full revenge of all actors and abettors of this odious design,' and calling upon all kings, princes, and states to do the like.[2]

Grignon, the French envoy in England, was also ordered to assist the King; but he knew very well that he could effect nothing, and feared to injure France, so that his efforts were no more effectual than were those of the Dutch Embassy.[3]

Not content with seeking foreign intervention, Charles next endeavoured to enter into direct communication with his father's rebellious subjects. Accordingly he wrote a pathetic appeal to Fairfax to reinstate the King, and it was reported that Fairfax actually pleaded with the council of officers for the King's life.[4] Lastly, as a final resource, Charles sent to the House of Commons a

[1] Von Raumer, *History of the Seventeenth Century*, ii. p. 377. *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 212.

[2] *French Papers*, R.O., iii. 18th-28th January 1649. *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 195-7.

[3] *Von Raumer*, ii. p. 377.

[4] *Dom. State Papers*, R.O., 23rd January 1649.

blank paper, signed and sealed by himself, on which they might inscribe what terms they chose as the price of his father's life.[1]

In doing this he acted in direct disobedience to his father's most solemn commands.

'I conjure you,' the King had written in a letter addressed to his wife, his son, and their advisers, 'by your unspotted faithfulnesse, by all that you love, by all that is good, that no threatenings, no apprehension of danger to my person, make you stir one jot from any foundation in relation to that authority which Charles is born to. I have alreddy cast up what I am like to suffer, which I shall meet, by the grace of God, with that constancy that befits me. Only I desire that consolation, that assurance from you, as I may justly hope that my cause shall not end with my misfortunes, by asseuring mee that misplaced pittie to mee do not prejudice my sone's right. . . . No man's person ought to be put in ballance with this cause.'[2]

But a disobedience so unselfish, springing solely from filial affection, must be counted to the younger Charles for righteousness, and perhaps he never showed to greater advantage than in the moment when he offered to purchase his father's life by the voluntary resignation of his inheritance.

But all proved unavailing, and on February 4th the news of the King's death was broken to the Prince by Dr. Goffe, who, after some general conversation, addressed him suddenly as 'Your Majesty.' Charles comprehended instantly, and bursting into tears, rushed into his bedroom, where he indulged his grief in solitude.[3]

Among the exiles the news spread horror. Montrose fainted when he heard it, and vowed, on recovery, to dedicate his life to vengeance.[4] Rupert published a de-

[1] *Ellis, Letters*, 1st series, vol. iii., frontispiece.
[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 242-4.
[3] *Ellis, Letters*, 2nd series, iii. p. 347. Gardiner, i. p. 20.
[4] *Wishart* (edition 1720), p. 165.

1649 February-March

claration of his intention to bring to 'condign punishment' all who had had any share in the 'murder' of his uncle.[1] And Ormonde wrote to Charles that duty demanded 'a justice on these inhuman parricides proportional, if the world can afford it, to their unparalleled villany. To which end,' he concluded, 'I offer my life and the uttermost of my endeavours.'[2]

Nor were others behindhand in expressing their abhorrence of 'the accursed assassination,' 'the most horrid murder and treason,' 'this barbarous and most inhuman action,' which were the mildest phrases they could find for it.

'It is an act so transcendently abominable, as I abhor even to mention it, but that I thought it necessary to acquaint you with it,' wrote Nicholas to Ormonde.[3]

The populace of Holland, France, and Spain were scarcely less affected. Strickland, the Parliamentary agent at the Hague, dared not show himself in the streets lest he should be torn in pieces. The Dutch clergy came in a body to visit Charles and express their 'detestation of the said horrid murder,' and preached in all the churches against 'the impiety and wickedness thereof.' Even the cautious States-General came to condole with the young King, and formally recognised him as his father's heir, in which the Provincial States of Holland to followed their example. 'The expressions here made the King are as far beyond expectation, as they are a shame to all monarchs,' averred Hyde.[4]

In France the outcry was the same.

'Our nation is here so odious for ye horrid death of our blessed and glorious master and sovereign as ye French offer ye English, without distinction, great violence and insolence, for no cause, upon every occasion,' reported Nicholas from Caen.[5]

[1] *Prince Rupert, his Declaration*, 9th March 1649. British Museum.
[2] Carte's *Ormonde*, vi. p. 607.
[3] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 109-13. *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 215.
[4] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 223. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 118.
[5] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 115.

On the widowed Queen the blow fell with terrible force at a time when long suspense, sleepless nights, and the sufferings of actual want had sapped her strength of both mind and body.

The general jealousy of Mazarin, and the frequent disputes of the French Crown with the Parliament of Paris, had culminated at last in civil war—the war of the Fronde—which was destined to devastate France during the next five years. Henrietta must indeed have feared that she was about to see re-enacted in her native land the tragedy that had exiled her from the land of her adoption. As the English Parliament had begun with an attack on Strafford, so the Parisian Parliament began with an attack on Mazarin. Both desired to control taxation; both demanded guarantees for the liberty of the subject; but there the superficial resemblance ended. The English Parliament possessed real legislative power, and claimed at least to represent the nation, while the Parisian Parliament was a mere judicial assembly, the members of which held their office from the Crown. The English war was waged for conscience' sake, in defence, as both sides believed, of true religion and the English Constitution. The war of the Fronde—which derived its very name from a childish game—was, from the outset, a mere succession of selfish intrigues. No common end, no exalted and generous motives bound the partisans to the common cause. To the Parliament the high-sounding phrases about public liberties were but another name for private privileges; to the people patriotism was a convenient synonym for riot and plunder. And the princes and nobles, whether they fought for Crown or Parliament, sought each the gratification of personal ambitions and animosities, the satisfaction of private grievances and jealousies, and moved in obedience to the whims of the ladies who pulled the strings of faction. 'It is to the ladies, above all, that the Fronde belongs,' says M. Cousin,[1] and it was, in truth, little more than a pastime for the *beaux esprits*

[1] *La Jeunesse de Mme. de Longueville*, p. 56.

and *belles dames* of France. As to the means they employed against the Court, all were equally unscrupulous, all equally ready to call to their aid the Spanish foes of their country, and it was Mazarin alone—the stranger, the Italian upstart, against whom they clamoured—who remained throughout unshaken in his loyalty to the interests of France.[1] 1649 January

On the night of January 5th-6th, 1649, the Court fled secretly from Paris, accompanied by the Duc d'Orléans and the Prince de Condé, with their families. The Parliament thereupon declared itself a committee of government, and gradually the discontented nobles stole back to the city to offer their swords to the popular cause. First came Charles de Lorraine, Duc d'Elbœuf, with his two sons; then Armand de Bourbon, Prince de Conti, and François, Prince de Marsillac, better known by his later title of Duc de la Rochefoucauld, both obedient to the summons of Mme. de Longueville, who had refused to leave Paris with the Queen. These were followed by many others, among them the Duc de Bouillon, who promised the adhesion of his more famous brother, Turenne. And, last of all, came the handsome, fair-haired Duc de Beaufort, the idol of the people, 'the King of the Markets.' He was, though he knew it not, but a tool in the hands of Paul de Gondi, Coadjutor-Archbishop of Paris, and—afterwards—Cardinal de Retz.

'I did not find that his imprisonment had given him any more sense, but it had greatly increased his reputation,' wrote the cynical churchman. 'I needed a phantom, but only a phantom and, fortunately for me, this one happened to be a grandson of Henri-le-Grand, and could speak the language of the markets, a talent not common among the children of Henri-le-Grand. He also had a great deal of long, fair hair; you cannot imagine the importance of this circumstance, you cannot conceive the influence it had on the people.'[2]

[1] Chéruel, *Minorité de Louis XIV.*, iii. and iv. *passim.*

[2] *Mémoires du Cardinal de Retz*, i. pp. 147-8.

The Coadjutor himself, brilliant, eloquent unscrupulous, and possessed with a passion for intrigue equalled only by his genius for it, lost no opportunity of inflaming the minds of the people. In the streets of the capital riot and pillage were the order of the day. Without the walls, Condé, for the moment the mainstay of the Court, steadily concentrated his troops, intending to reduce the city by famine.

In the meantime, the English Queen suffered all kinds of privation. For six months she had not received her pension, and, on a cold, snowy day, about a week after the flight of the Court, the Coadjutor found her sitting by the bedside of her little daughter, Henriette, the baby born at Exeter, who had been brought from England disguised as a beggar-boy by the faithful Lady Morton. The Queen greeted the Coadjutor with the remark: 'You see I am keeping Henriette company. The poor child cannot get up to-day for want of a fire.'

The generosity of the Coadjutor was stirred. 'You will do me the justice to believe,' he wrote, 'that the Princess of England did not stay in bed next day for want of a faggot.' Nor did his sympathy stop there. He flew to the Parliament and, with all the facile eloquence of which he was master, poured forth his shame and horror that the granddaughter of the beloved Henri IV. should have lacked a fire in the month of January, at the Palace of the Louvre. The Parliament, moved like himself, at once sent to the English Queen a present of 40,000 livres, which Henrietta refused to accept until the Queen-Regent granted her permission to do so.[1]

On February 13th the arrival of her second son, James, from whom she had been parted for nearly five years, cast a brief gleam of light on the gloom that surrounded her. He had left the Hague in obedience to her summons, on January 6th, the very day on which the war of the Fronde had broken out, and had been met at Cambrai by a second letter from his mother, warning him of the

[1] *Mémoires du Cardinal de Retz*, i. p. 149.

state of Paris, and bidding him delay his journey until further notice. The Archduke Leopold, governor of the Netherlands, heard of his dilemma, and courteously offered him quarters at the Abbey of St. Amand, where he remained hospitably entertained by the monks, until February 8th. At last, however, Henrietta obtained leave for him to enter Paris, and on February 13th he made his appearance at the Louvre while she was at dinner. Coming hastily into the room, he knelt to ask her blessing, and she, raising him from the floor, clasped him in her arms, and overwhelmed him with joyful kisses.[1] 1649 February

But the company of her son could not avert her thoughts from her husband, regarding whose fate she was still ignorant. In her deep and painful suspense she suffered acute anxiety lest her English letters should fail to reach her, and at last she despatched a gentleman to seek news at the Court of St. Germains. There he learnt the fatal tidings of the King's death, but neither he, nor any one else, dared to communicate them to the Queen. Her attendants begged the chaplain to remain in the presence, ready to comfort their mistress when the blow fell, and the day dragged on wearily. Dinner was over, conversation languished, the thoughts of all absorbed in that they dared not speak, and at last the Queen, unable to endure the atmosphere of suspense, burst into bitter complaints of the tardiness of her messenger. Jermyn thereupon remarked that a gentleman 'so faithful, so prompt in executing the commands of Her Majesty' could not have failed to return sooner had he been the bearer of good news. His significant tone struck the Queen's ear, and she turned on him sharply, crying, 'What is it? I perceive plainly that you know.' He evaded a direct answer, but his overstrung mistress would accept no equivocations, and at last wrung from him the bare truth. She listened to his faltering phrases in absolute silence, 'without words, without action, without motion, like a

[1] *Diary of Père Cyprien de Gamache, Court of Charles I.*, ii. p. 397. *Memoirs of James II.*, i. pp. 45-6.

statue.' Thus she sat immovable, till evening fell, while her horror-struck servants wept and sobbed around her. In despair, they sent at last for the Duchess of Vendôme, her sister-in-law, and the Duchess, holding her hands, kissing her, and talking to her unceasingly, succeeded at last in rousing her from her stupor.[1] Afterwards Henrietta herself remarked to Madame de Motteville, that she only wondered at her own survival of the loss of such a husband, 'bon, juste, sage, digne de son amitié et l'amour de ses sujets.'[2]

For a brief period she retired to the convent of the Carmelites in the Faubourg St. Jacques, but it was no time to indulge her grief in private, action was imperatively necessary, and soon the affairs of her son recalled her to the Louvre.

There her niece 'Mademoiselle' found her, when she returned to Paris in April, after the proclamation of the Peace of Rueil, which had patched up a short truce between the Court and the Frondeurs. The first paroxysms of Henrietta's grief were passed, and she was now calm and composed to a degree that astonished and almost shocked her niece, seeing that she had so recently and so tragically lost a husband who 'treated her divinely.' Mademoiselle concluded, however, that her aunt bore her sorrows *par force d'esprit*, for, she reflected, 'God grants us extraordinary strength on extraordinary occasions.'[3]

Henrietta, indeed, mourned truly for her husband. 'She carried a perpetual mourning on her person, and in her heart,' says her friend, 'as much, at least, as was possible to her disposition, for by nature she was more gay than serious.'[4]

[1] Père Cyprien, *Court of Charles I.*, ii. pp. 381-2.
[2] *Mme. de Motteville*, iii. p. 205.
[3] *Montpensier*, i. p. 210.
[4] *De Motteville*, iii. p. 206.

CHAPTER V

Effects of the King's Death — Overtures from Scotland — Charles invited to Ireland—Scottish Factions at the Hague—Montrose —The Engagers—Arrival of Argyle's Commissioners—Their favourable Opinion of Charles—The Princess Sophie—Murder of Dorislaus—Charles's Reply to the Scots—He accepts the Scheme of Montrose—Hyde and Cottington sent to Madrid.

CHARLES'S first action as King was to cause all those of his father's privy council who were present at the Hague, namely the Lords Brentford, Cottington, Culpepper, Hopton, Sir Richard Lane, and Sir Edward Hyde, to be sworn of his own council, and he added to their number his secretary, Sir Robert Long.[1] 1649 February

His next thought concerned the disposal of his own person, since a long stay at the Hague, where he was absolutely dependent on the Prince of Orange, seemed impossible.

William II. treated his brother-in-law with a magnificent generosity: he charged his support on his own town of Breda, assigned wages to Charles's servants at the rate paid to his own household, and supplied the new King with mourning for his father, besides all the necessaries of life.[2] But he was himself heavily burdened with debts, the States were undisguisedly weary of their uninvited guests, and the Royalists were in daily apprehension of the arrival of ambassadors from the English Commonwealth, an event which would render the King's further residence in Holland inconsistent with his honour.

The horror inspired by the trial and death of Charles I. had produced a revulsion of feeling favourable to his heir

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 2.
[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 199, 209.

in England, Scotland, and Ireland. Yet in England there was nothing to hope, for the power of the army prevailed, and on February 7th, 1649, the remnant of the Long Parliament, called the Rump, voted the abolition of Monarchy as 'unnecessary, burdensome, and dangerous to the safety and public interests of the people of this nation.' A month later, March 9th, the Duke of Hamilton, Lord Holland, and Lord Capel died, like their master, on the scaffold.[1]

But in the sister kingdoms, where the power of the English army was not yet felt, the aspect of affairs was hopeful. The Irish confederates resolved 'not to stick at trifles' in face of so great a calamity, made peace with the Lord-Lieutenant, and enabled him to draw a new army into the field. At the end of January Rupert arrived at Kinsale with his fleet, and Ormonde was so well pleased that he sent Lord Byron to Paris to render an account to the Queen, and hasten the coming of Charles to Ireland.

'Money, and that a little,' he wrote, 'if joined with the Prince his presence, with an undivided council and a contracted retinue, would infallibly end the matter here.'[2]

Scotland, where Argyle now ruled supreme, was hardly less resentful of her Sovereign's fate. The alliance with Cromwell was effectually broken, the whole nation put on mourning, and on February 5th, 1649, Charles II. was proclaimed King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland.[3] The exercise of the regal authority was, however, made conditional on Charles's acceptance of the Solemn League and Covenant, by which he would be bound to establish 'the true, Protestant, reformed religion in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government' in Scotland, England, and Ireland, to suppress all other Churches, and to visit with rigid persecution all who

[1] Gardiner's *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, i. p. 3.
[2] Carte's *Ormonde*, vi. p. 596.
[3] *Ellis*, *Letters*, 2nd series, iii. p. 348.

ventured to reject the Presbyterian faith and form of worship.[1] Such a course, involving the desertion of his own religion and of all his own and his father's best friends, did not seem very likely to commend itself to the young King, and before proceeding further Argyle judged it wise to ascertain his sentiments on the subject. Sir Joseph Douglas, sent over for this purpose, reached the Hague February 20th, and gained the King's promise to receive commissioners from the Scottish Kirk and Parliament, through the mediation of the Prince of Orange. But though the Prince lent the Scots his countenance, he assured them that the King would never accept the Covenant, nor consent to the required condemnation of malignants, and he added warningly: 'Ye call any man a malignant whom ye please. . . . I would therefore gladly know who *are* the malignants, for I find there is no argument that so works upon his Majesty as that.' The Scot whom he addressed was at a loss for a reply. 'Here, I profess, I was at a strait,' he wrote in his account of the interview; and the Prince went on to speak of the internal divisions of the Presbyterians, showing an intimate knowledge of Scottish affairs, derived, he explained, from the King's English Ministers. 'Ye may lose both yourselves and the cause,' he said. 'How many Presbyterians soever ye be, if ye live at a distance, as I hear ye do in Scotland, ye will be able to do nothing at all.'[2]

With this good counsel and warning the Scottish envoy returned to Edinburgh. In the meantime discussion raged hotly at the exiled Court. Hyde and his party stood out for Ireland. Percy, Culpepper, and Long were for Scotland, and were so confident of the Queen's support that Percy wrote to urge her speedy coming to the Hague as the only means to overthrow Hyde's influence. But Henrietta had been won over

[1] Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i. p. 20. *Clarendon*, *History*, xii. p. 4.

[2] Robert Baillie's *Letters and Journals*, iii. pp. 75-9. Spang to Baillie, 9th-19th March 1649.

1649 March

to the Irish project by Byron, whose good news had, as he believed, saved her life. It had at least roused her from 'the excess of grief and melancholy' into which her bereavement had plunged her.[1] She received Percy's letter 'with much scorn,' replied that Scotland 'bid too faintly for the King's presence,'[2] and declared her intention of accompanying her son to Ireland.[3] At the same time she desired that all offence to the Scots might be avoided. 'You will understand by my Lord Byron what our judgments are here,' wrote Jermyn to Hyde, 'and particularly with how much care and apprehension we look upon the satisfying the Scots, in case the resolution be taken, of which I see no cause to doubt, of the King going into Ireland.'[4]

As to ways and means, Henrietta hoped money might be forthcoming from prizes captured by Rupert; thought that the Prince of Orange could pledge his own credit for her son's debts at the Hague, and offered to sell her own jewels, already in pawn. This offer was absolutely useless, because the jewels, before they could be sold, had to be redeemed, and there was not money to redeem 'the least parcel of them.'[5]

There remained the hope of borrowing a considerable sum from the States-General, but the Calvinistic Dutch Protestants distrusted the Irish Catholics, and had been assured by the Scots that the only hindrance to the King coming to Scotland was his intention of re-establishing Episcopacy there. They therefore intimated to Charles that they could lend no money unless he took the Covenant and went to Scotland. In reply he laid before the Provincial States of Holland a brief statement of his position, explaining that he had no intention of altering the laws of Scotland, but that the Scots wished to alter the laws of England and Ireland,

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 237. Byron to Ormonde.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 235. *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 120-3.
[3] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 237.
[4] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxvii. fol. 30.
[5] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 120-3. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 8.

and had excluded 'five parts of six' of their own nobility and gentry from any share in the government.

A few weeks later he asked the loan of some ships and £20,000 on the security of the Irish customs. The States-General passed the request on to the Provincial States, and, pending their decision, Charles remained at the Hague.[1]

'The truth is, I cannot guess at the time of our removal, though the King be resolved for Ireland, and desires to be there as soon as may be, and no man is now so mad as openly avow a dislike of it,' wrote a Royalist from the Hague; 'but the want of money is so incredible, and the debts so great, that I know not how we shall get over these difficulties. And you must know that, though no man opposes the going into Ireland, yet many are in their hearts against it, and we are glad to cherish any rubs. The Scots faction is strong and bold, and have friends in this State.'[2]

Every Scottish party was now, in fact, represented at the Hague, to the increasing distraction of the exiled Court.

'I came to the Hague about ten days since, where, not long before, the Earl of Lanerick—now Duke of Hamilton—was arrived,' reported Byron to Ormonde. 'There I found likewise the Marquess of Montrose, the Earls of Lauderdale, Calendar, and Seaforth, the Lords St. Clair and Napier, and old Will Murray. These, though all of one nation, are subdivided into four several factions. The Marquess of Montrose, with the Lords St. Clair and Napier, are very earnest for the King going into Ireland; all the rest oppose it. I find Duke Hamilton very moderate, and certainly he would be much more were it not for the violence of Lauderdale, who haunts him like a fury. Calendar and Seaforth have a faction apart, and so hath Will Murray, employed

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 238, 252, 264-5, 279. *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 482.

[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 250, 30th March 1649.

here by Argyle.[1]' First of all that ill-assorted company had arrived Lanerick and Lauderdale. Banished from Scotland by the Act of Classes, they had come to Holland about the end of February, and there Lanerick heard the news of his brother's execution, by which he himself became Duke of Hamilton.

Close on the heels of the Engagers followed the 'Great Marquis' of Montrose. Among all the gallant men who spent themselves for the Stuarts there was none greater than this greatest of the Grahams, none who served the cause with a more unselfish, whole-hearted devotion, none who was more ungratefully used by the master for whom he so willingly gave his life.

Montrose was a great soldier; but he was also much more—a cultivated and accomplished gentleman, a poet, wit, and scholar; above all, a hero who is remembered even better for his nobility of character and the grandeur of his bearing in the hour of failure and death than for his military genius and brilliant successes.

He possessed that greatest of gifts, the power of winning the hearts of men, 'so as when he list he could have led them in a chain,' and his commanding personality accomplished the almost impossible feat of welding the wild, mutually hostile Highland clans into a united and formidable army. His friends loved him with a love called 'preposterous' by his foes,[2] and all Europe admired him. The graces of his person were not less remarkable than those of his mind. He excelled in all field sports, games, and martial exercises; he had 'a singular grace' in riding, and his strength and agility, his 'exquisitely proportioned' form, the brightness of his penetrating grey eyes, his 'very princely carriage,' his manners 'so affable, so courteous, so benign,' struck all beholders with wonder.[3]

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 238, 30th March 1649.

[2] Napier's *Montrose*, p. 644. Napier of Culcreuch to Napier, 31st May 1646. [3] *Napier*, i. App. xxi. *Wishart*, p. 194 (ed. 1720).

His detractors—who has them not?—complained that 'he played the part of a hero too much,' 'lived as in a romance,' and had a manner 'stately to affectation.'[1] But if he made a conscious study of greatness—and his favourite reading was 'the actions of great men'—the greatness he sought was truly that of the soul, and no empty pose.[2] Even the Cardinal de Retz, whose views of his fellow-men are in general remarkable for their cynicism, was roused to enthusiasm by the Scottish Marquis.

'The Count of Montrose, a Scot, chief of the house of Graham, was the only man in the world who ever realised for me the ideal of certain heroes whom one finds only in the *Lives* of Plutarch,' he declared. 'He sustained the cause of the King of England in his country with a greatness of soul unequalled in this age.'[3] In truth the Marquis, though treated but coldly by Charles I. in his prosperous days, had fallen, none the less, under the Stuart spell. 'I never had passion upon earth so strong as that to do the King, your father, service,'[4] he wrote to Charles II., and in the first Civil War he had served the King with a courage, devotion, and success that earned him the undying hatred of his covenanting countrymen. At the close of the war, when the King had taken refuge with the Scottish army, Montrose sheathed his sword at the royal command, and, excommunicated by the Kirk, proscribed and dispossessed by the Parliament, sought refuge on the Continent.

The King had bidden him seek the Queen, and to Paris he went in 1647, but Henrietta, bent just then on an alliance with his deadly foes, the Covenanters, failed to receive him as he merited.[5] Though deeply wounded by her coldness, he would not desert his

[1] Burnet, *History of his own Times*, i. pp. 53-71 (Clarendon Press).
[2] *Napier*, i. p. 91.
[3] *De Retz*, i. p. 319.
[4] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 470, 28th January 1649.
[5] *Clarendon*, *History*, xii. p. 15.

master's cause. Inducement so to do he did not lack: Europe rang with his fame; France professed 'a huge esteem of him,' and Mazarin offered him a Lieutenant-Generalship in the French army, with the promise of being made a Marshal of France, and Captain of the King's own Guards within a few months, with a pension of 1200 crowns, over and above his pay. It was the opinion of Montrose's nephew, Lord Napier, that he might, if he chose, become 'one of the most distinguished strangers in Europe,' but the Marquis distrusted France, fearing, as he explained to his nephew, that by accepting her favours 'he would be forced to connive and wink at his Prince's ruin.' He accepted instead the invitation of the Emperor, and set out for Austria in March 1648.[1] Ferdinand III. received him most graciously, gave him the rank of an Imperial Field-Marshal, permitted him to raise levies for the English King in the Empire, and sent him to Flanders, with letters of recommendation to the Archduke Leopold.

Montrose arrived at Brussels in the autumn of 1648, and entered into a close correspondence with Rupert.[2] Each found the other a man after his own heart; but Rupert was tied to the fleet, and in January 1649 set sail for Ireland. Very shortly after this, Montrose received a letter from the Prince of Wales summoning him to meet and confer with Chancellor Hyde.[3] He was willing to obey, but a severe frost closed the rivers and prevented the meeting for some weeks. When, at last, it took place, Charles was expecting the Scottish commissioners, and bade Hyde induce Montrose to remain at a distance from the Hague.[4] This injunction was extremely repugnant to the Chancellor, who judged the Marquis 'a man of the clearest honour, courage, and affection to the King's service,' and worthy to be re-

[1] *Napier*, p. 665. Lord Napier to his wife, 14th June 1648.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 677-84. Correspondence of Rupert and Montrose.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 684. Charles to Montrose, 20th January 1649.
[4] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 16. *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 232.

ceived before any of his countrymen. He persuaded him, however, to submit to the restriction for a time. When he heard of the arrival of Lanerick and Lauderdale, Montrose, who intended himself to raise a Royalist army in Scotland, wrote to warn Charles against them. 'I shall not trouble you with much, only let me intreat you take heed to my country-men's cunninge, who, upon feare of my meddling, doe give out Hamilton's death, and that Argyle should be fled from Scotland, and that all the country is the King's. All which is only to abuse the King, and withhold, or at least retard, him from taking the courses for his own safety, for they know iff once we ingage, the busynes is half-done, and that in a few weeks they must be honest men, or else have no brains left to take their pairts.'[1]

In spite of this Charles received the Engagers graciously, and Montrose, fearful of their influence, thereupon came to Court with a large train of servants and officers. The King made him welcome; he could not, in honour, do otherwise, and immediately set to work to bring about a reconciliation between the Marquis and the Engagers. He soon found that this was 'a business too hard to bring to pass'; yet, at first sight, it did not seem impossible. The new Duke of Hamilton was a brave and honourable man, whose character and sympathies approximated far more closely to the Cavalier than to the Covenanting type. He had never been able to withhold a certain admiration from Montrose, the enemy of his house, and in the previous December he had made overtures through Hyde, professing 'a willingness to join with my Lord Marquis of Montrose, and all the King's party; and that he would be so far from contesting about command that he would be a serjeant under Montrose.'[2]

But Montrose—who had suffered many things from the duplicity of the elder Hamilton, and had rejected his

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxvii. fol. 51.

[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 460, 5th December 1648.

alliance in 1643 on the grounds that he 'had been, and would ever be untrustie'[1]—could not bring himself to trust a scion of that house. He acknowledged that all Lanerick's actions had been, so far, 'open-faced, and without the least treachery,'[2] but he would not take him by the hand. In this he did him an injustice, for the second Duke had, indeed, nothing of his brother's 'serpentine' nature, and was 'still the same man he pretended to be,' which, says Hyde, 'was a rare virtue in the men of that time.'[3]

Offended by Montrose's implacability, Hamilton thenceforth gave himself up to the influence of Lauderdale.

'These Lords that are here already, Lanerick and Lauderdale, abate not an ace of their damnable Covenant in all their discourses; and why we should be so fond as to expect anything but mischief from the rest, I know not,' wrote an indignant Cavalier; 'the Marquess of Montrose is likewise here, and of clean another temper, abhorring even the most moderate of his countrymen.'[4]

The Engagers, on their part, abhorred Montrose as heartily.

They now not only refused to unite with him, but would not so much as remain in the same room, and invariably walked out as he entered, even from the royal presence. 'They will not salute or speak to him, nay, not look where they think he is; and this I have observed with my own eyes,'[5] said the Prince of Orange.

Further, they demanded his banishment from Court, as a person excommunicated by the Kirk, and requested Charles not to attend the sermons of Dr. Wishart—chaplain to a Scottish regiment in the State's service—because he had refused the Covenant, though their real reason was, as all the world knew, that Wishart had

[1] *Baillie*, ii. p. 67.
[2] *Memoirs of Sir Philip Warwick*, p. 104.
[3] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 5.
[4] *Carte, Letters*, xii. p. 232, 16th March 1649.
[5] *Baillie*, iii. p. 78.

written a history of Montrose's brilliant campaigns in the Highlands.

The King showed his resentment of 'this very absurd behaviour' by 'using the Marquis of Montrose with the more countenance, and hearing the Doctor preach with the more attention.' The councillors were not less indignant, and Hyde ventured to remonstrate with Lauderdale and to question him about the motives of a conduct that 'appeared ridiculous to all sober men.' The Covenanting Earl replied at first with vague denunciations of Montrose's 'barbarities,' but, being pressed, was forced to own that 'he did not know he was guilty of anything but what was done in the field,' for which, he hastened to add, Scotland would never pardon him. He expressed himself subsequently with more passion, swearing, in the presence of Sir William Armorer and Colonel Will Legge, that, though he wished the King's restoration above all things, yet 'he would much rather that he should never be restored than that James Graham should be permitted to come into the Court.'[1]

Hyde thereafter abandoned the attempt to convert Lauderdale and turned his attention to Hamilton, whom he sought to win by the aid of Lord Newburgh's wife, Lady Aubigny, as she was still called, though her first husband, George Stuart, Lord Aubigny, a younger brother of the Duke of Richmond, had fallen seven years before at Edgehill. This lady, being esteemed 'a woman of a very great wit,' had been trusted in more than one political intrigue during the Civil War. Later, she and her second husband had been implicated in the King's attempt to escape from Hampton Court, and she was besides 'no stranger to the most secret transactions with the Scots.' Thus she had become intimate with Hamilton—then Lord Lanerick—during his brother's lifetime, and she now renewed this intimacy at the Hague. Her friendship with Hyde was of long standing, and she was therefore able to arrange, without difficulty, an appa-

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xii. pp. 17, 18.

rently chance meeting between the two at her house, where they held an hour's conversation together, and parted at last mutually pleased with one another. Next morning Hyde sought Hamilton's lodgings early, and the Duke, though still in bed, admitted him, and gave orders that all other inquirers should be told that he was asleep. The conversation was continued without interruption for nearly two hours. The Chancellor explained his views about the Covenant and the King's earnest desire for a reconciliation between Montrose and the Engagers. Hamilton replied cautiously at first, that only time and patience could lessen the power of the Kirk; that there was, in Scotland, 'so great a superstition for the Covenant that whosoever should speak against it would lose all credit,' and that if he ventured to show the least inclination towards Montrose, 'all his own friends would fall from him and abhor him.' Then, waxing confidential, he burst into complaints of his 'hard' condition; declared his 'reverence' for the Anglican communion, in which he had been educated; lamented that he had ever taken the Covenant, which he 'perfectly detested'; and acknowledged his bondage to Lauderdale, of whom, however, he spoke with affection as his 'friend and kinsman.' 'I dare say nothing of this to him, either against the Covenant or for the Marquis of Montrose,' he concluded, 'and I believe, if I should, he would rather chose to kill me than to join with me, so much is he transported with prejudice in both these particulars, and so incapable to hear reason upon either of those arguments.'

At this juncture the person under discussion entered the room 'in his night-gown,' and broke off the conference abruptly. Nor could it be renewed, for Hamilton confessed that Lauderdale's jealousy was so great that he could not converse with Hyde openly, and the death of Lady Aubigny soon deprived them of any opportunity of meeting privately.[1]

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xii. pp. 20-2.

The arrival of Argyle's commissioners did not add to the general harmony. They reached the Hague $\frac{26\text{th March}}{5\text{th April}}$, six in number, the Earl of Cassilis, George Winram of Libberton, Brodie of Brodie, and Alexander Jeffray representing the Parliament, and two ministers, Robert Baillie and James Wood, the General Assembly of the Kirk. 1649 April

At their first audience of the King they professed their horror of the late King's murder, and then opened negotiations with a demand for the banishment of all excommunicated persons from Court, 'and especially James Graham, sometime Earl of Montrose, who, abandoning the Covenant, and despising the oath of God, did invade his native country, and, with most inhuman and barbarous cruelty, burnt and wasted divers parts thereof . . . and still to this day continues in the highest contempt against God, under the fearful sentence of excommunication, without the least sign of repentance.'

Charles parried this adroitly with a brief note, in his own hand: 'I desire and expect that you deliver all the propositions or desires you are instructed to present to me, before I make an answer to any particular one, being resolved to consider of the whole before I declare my resolution on any part.'[1] And, though the commissioners reiterated their demand, they received only the curt response: 'I do insist upon my former answer.'[2]

Upon this they yielded and handed in a complete list of the conditions that they were instructed to impose. Charles was to take the Covenant, to force it on all his subjects, to confirm all acts establishing Presbyterianism in all or any of his dominions, and to refer all civil affairs to the management of Parliament, all ecclesiastical questions to the decision of the General Assembly of the Kirk.[3]

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 475. *Baillie*, iii. p. 86.
[2] *Ibid.* iii. App. lxxxv., lxxxvi.; iii. p. 513, 1st-10th April 1649.
[3] *Ibid.* ii. p. 475; iii. p. 514, 5th-15th April 1649.

The King had, of course, no intention of accepting these terms, but neither was he in haste to break off the treaty. He had already defeated the Scots on two points, namely, by refusing to acknowledge Argyle's Parliament as legal and by declining to receive their demands piecemeal, and he believed that he had only to remain firm to induce them to moderate their demands.[1] Accordingly he delayed and temporised; he was already learning to be all things to all men, and even the stern Presbyterian ministers felt his personal charm. A few days after their first audience they presented him with the two Covenants, the Directory, Confession of Faith, and Catechism, all bound together 'in a book so handsome as we could get them,' and expressed their readiness to satisfy him on any point whereon he might have scruples. His gracious reception of themselves and their gift touched their hearts, and they wrote of him with something like enthusiasm: 'His Majesty is of a very sweet and courteous disposition; it is all the pities in the world bot he were in good company.' A day or two later Baillie wrote again: 'It is verily a great pity of the King; he is one of the most gentle, innocent, well-inclined Princes, so far as yet appears, that lives in the world; a trimme person and of a manly carriage, understands pretty well, speaks not much.' And again: 'It were a thousand pities that so sweet a man should not be at one with all his people.'[2]

His reluctance to come to terms with them they attributed to the influence of the 'very evil generation both of Scots and English' by which he was surrounded, and especially to Dr. Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, who was the author of some controversial tracts. Most of Charles's councillors they found to be 'of Prince Rupert's faction, who caresses Montrose and press mightily to have the King to Ireland,' while the 'Bedchamber men' who, with Percy and Culpepper, made up the

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 476, 12th April 1649.
[2] *Baillie*, iii. pp. 86-90, 31st March, 3rd-17th April 1649.

Queen's party, were 'much averse from the League and Covenant.'[1]

To counteract all these hostile influences the commissioners sought external alliances. The disposition of the States was, as we have seen, in their favour, and they had a firm friend in the Dowager-Princess of Orange, who had been persuaded by Percy and Lauderdale that the King would marry her daughter in the event of his agreeing with the Scots.[2]

The commissioners were the more inclined to this alliance because the English Cavaliers opposed to the Orange Princess the youngest daughter of the Queen of Bohemia. The Palatine family, as sufferers for the Protestant cause, had long enjoyed the sympathy and confidence of the Puritan party, but the steady adherence of the Queen to her brother, Charles I., and the part played by her sons, Rupert and Maurice, in the Civil War had changed all that. True, her eldest son, Charles Louis, the Elector Palatine, had taken great pains to show his sympathy with the Parliamentarians, but, since the King's death, even he had been forced to shake the dust of England from his feet and to make his *devoirs* to the new King, his cousin, at the Hague.[3]

The Scots could not then expect much aid from that quarter, and, though they visited Elizabeth of Bohemia within an hour of their first audience of the King, and besought her to reclaim him from his ungodly company, they speedily discovered that she was wholly on the side of their arch-enemy Montrose. She argued his cause vehemently with the family of Orange and the members of the States-General; she corresponded with him freely and intimately, invited him to hunt and shoot in her company, had his portrait painted by Honthorst, who was a member of her household, and hung it in her chamber 'to fright away the Brethren,'[4] as she declared.

[1] *Baillie*, iii. pp. 87-8.
[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 238.
[3] *Dom. State Papers*, R.O. Sophie to Rupert, 13th April 1649.
[4] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 476. *Napier*, pp. 711-22; Correspondence of Montrose with the Queen of Bohemia.

In short, the Marquis was a *persona grata* at her Court—a suitor, so it was whispered, for the hand of her second daughter, Louise, and on terms of friendship with the young Princess Sophie, the supposed aspirant to the royal alliance.[1]

As for Sophie herself, she was as staunch a loyalist as any of her family, and wrote very scornfully of Argyle's emissaries to her brother Rupert. 'Here also are the Scottish commissioners' she told him, 'who every day bring some new proposal to the King, full of impertinency, for they would not that the King should keep any honest man about him, for which they are in great favour with the Princess of Orange, who declares herself much for the Presbyterians.'[2]

Despite a Calvinistic education, Sophie was no Presbyterian, and greatly preferred the Church of her English mother to that in which she had been bred. To the disgust of the Scots she was constantly to be seen at the King's side in church, and Charles appeared to take much pleasure in her company. The merry, fresh young girl, with her lively wit, gay laugh, and unaffected manners, was a pleasing contrast to the handsome, haughty French cousin with whom his mother had hoped to unite him. Not that Sophie was unconscious of the good complexion, graceful figure, and pretty curly hair with which Nature had endowed her, but her half-childish vanity was a very different thing from the hauteur of *La grande Mademoiselle*. She had been bred in a school of adversity, had known poverty and sorrow from her birth, and, as the youngest of a large family, she had been the darling of her sisters, who trained her with careful solicitude, and the plaything of her many brothers, who tormented and petted her by turns. She was consequently neither shy nor conceited, perfectly natural, and at ease in all societies, and very well able to amuse her royal cousin when she chose to

[1] *Memoiren der Herzogin Sophie*, p. 41.

[2] *Dom. State Papers*, R.O. Sophie to Rupert, 13th April 1649.

take the trouble. On the whole she liked him, approved his personal appearance and natural wit, and, so long as he met her on terms of cousinly friendship, was ready to enjoy his society.

But Sophie, if gay, was also wise, and when Charles showed signs of sinking the cousin in the lover, she drew back alarmed. He told her one evening as they walked together on the promenade, that she was handsomer than his mistress, Lucy Walter, and added, among other things, that he hoped ere long to see her in England. Sophie was frightened, and the next evening did not find her, as usual, beside the King. Her mother, less prudent than the girl herself, had observed Charles's attentions with pleasure, and scolded her daughter for absenting herself from the evening walk. But Sophie replied that she had a corn on her foot which made exercise painful to her, and from that day she walked no more with her cousin.

'I was wise enough to know that the marriages of great Princes were not arranged in that way,' she wrote. And a year later Charles's conduct in taking the Covenant, and the subsequent death of the gallant Montrose, administered to the high-spirited Princess a shock of horror which effectually extinguished any tender feelings she had cherished for her royal lover.[1]

In the meantime, however, the Scottish commissioners regarded the ascendency of the Palatine and Montrose influence with suspicion and hatred, in which they had the full sympathy of the Engagers. It seemed, indeed, that a union between these two parties would not be difficult, and Spang, the minister of Campvere, profiting by the counsel of the Prince of Orange, had written to urge it before the coming of the commissioners. 'If ye come hither and bring not a full rescinding of what the Parliament has decreed against them, ye will be looked upon as most ingrate men; and none shall be gladder of their misery than the English malignants, and James

[1] *Memoiren der Herzogin Sophie*, pp. 41-2.

1649 May

Graham, because they doe and have so opposed their plots.'[1] But the personal rivalry of the houses of Argyle and Hamilton precluded the possibility of political union. No hint of repealing the Act of Classes was offered, and Hamilton held steadily aloof from the commissioners, though Lauderdale was in daily communication with them, and many believed him to have a secret understanding with Argyle.[2]

While affairs stood thus there happened an event which made the King's removal from the Hague imperative. The States were already becoming restless under his long sojourn amongst them, had more than once mentioned the 'inconvenience' of it, and, but for the influence of the Prince of Orange, would have actually requested him to depart. Both they and the English councillors watched the mutual attitude of the rival Scottish factions with ever-growing anxiety, fearing lest Montrose should revenge himself 'upon those persons whom he contemned too much, and so the peace of the country where his Majesty was but a guest, would be violated by his subjects, as it were, in his own sight.'[3] And such an accident now came to pass, though not precisely in the manner apprehended.

Their commercial interests made England and the United Provinces mutually anxious for peace, and in the beginning of May the English Parliament sent over an envoy to negotiate for a treaty with the States. This man, Dr. Isaac Dorislaus, was Dutch by birth, but he had long resided in England, had been Judge-Advocate of Essex' army, and had acted as prosecuting counsel at the trial of the late King. With such a record his life could not be safe at the Hague, swarming, as it was, with Loyalists, Scottish and English, and on his arrival, the English resident there hastened to warn him of his danger. The warning availed nothing. On the evening

[1] *Baillie*, iii. p. 81, 19th March 1649.
[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 279, 20th April 1649.
[3] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 17.

of May 2nd-12th, as Dorislaus was sitting at supper in his inn, six men entered with drawn swords in their hands, and calmly bade the company sit still, for they intended no harm to any but the regicide. Having so spoken, one of them, Whitford, a son of the Bishop of Brechin, as calmly ran Dorislaus through the body, after which the six took their departure, leisurely, as they had come.[1] 1649 May

The Dutch populace hailed the deed with acclamation, and among the Royalists it was approved, as a 'deserved execution of that bloody villain.'[2] But Charles himself was 'exceedingly troubled and perplexed,' plainly perceiving the trouble into which this affair must plunge him. The States were, of course, bound to express their resentment of the occurrence, though they acted in a manner calculated to spare Charles's feelings as far as possible. To satisfy England the Prince of Orange was obliged to issue a proclamation against the murderers, and some show of proceeding to execute justice was made, but so slowly and with such excess of formality, that not one of them was arrested, though it was an open secret that most of them were Scots, and followers of Montrose. Whitford was sheltered by the Portuguese ambassador, who effected his escape to Brussels, and his comrades also succeeded in reaching the Spanish border in safety, all very well pleased with their exploit.[3]

But if the States were thus tender of their guest's feelings and of the lives of his subjects, they had no mind to risk the repetition of such scenes within their borders. Accordingly they conveyed to the young King a polite hint that his removal was considered desirable, since 'the multitude of strangers' collected at the Hague by his presence, made the maintenance of order and good government impossible.[4] And even the Prince of Orange judged it best that his brother-in-law should depart.[5]

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 24. Cary's *Memorials*, ii. p. 131.
[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 291-2. Nicholas to Ormonde, 7th June 1649.
[3] *Hist. MSS. Com.; Coke's Confessions*, Rept. 13, App. i. p. 592.
[4] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 26. [5] Green's *Princesses*, vi. p. 153.

It became necessary to decide immediately on some definite course of action; the Scottish commissioners were pressing impatiently for an answer to their proposals, and Charles made a final effort to induce Montrose and the Engagers to co-operate, by summoning both to deliver their opinions on Scottish affairs at the council board.

Montrose was ready enough to comply, 'being willing to deliver his opinion concerning things or persons before anybody, and in any place.'[1] The Engagers, however, refused to discuss the affairs of their country before the English council, and the King had to be satisfied with the delivery of their opinions in writing.

Lauderdale advised the acceptance of Argyle's conditions so far as they concerned Scotland alone, and Hamilton excused himself from offering his 'confused thoughts' on the plea of ignorance of the business concerned, 'by reason of the distance I have been at from the knowledge of your affairs.' Montrose declared, without hesitation, that compliance with the commissioners' demands could bring the King nothing but 'shame and ruin.' He pointed out that their terms, if granted, left Charles nothing but the shadowy name of royalty, reminded him that they had rewarded his father's confidence by selling him to 'his merciless enemies,' and bade him judge of their present sincerity by the fact that, at the very time of opening negotiations with himself, they had put to death the Marquis of Huntly for the sole crime of loyalty. 'And when they demand your Majesty's consent to all Acts establishing their League in all your other kingdoms, it is the same thing as if they should desire to undo you by your own leave and favour.'[2]

In all this there was sound sense. The King could not accede to the offered terms with honesty; he had not yet sunk to do so dishonestly, and he accordingly replied

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 30.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, 21st May 1649, xxxvii. fols. 112, 116, 117. *Napier*, ii. p. 700. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 127.

to the commissioners that he was willing to accept the National Covenant—which was in effect no more than an abjuration of Romanism—that he would maintain the civil and ecclesiastical government, as by law established, and all Acts of Parliament that had obtained the late King's consent, but he would not disturb the peace made by Ormonde in Ireland, nor would he interfere with either of his other kingdoms under Scottish dictation.[1]

The commissioners took this as an absolute refusal of their offers, which in fact it was. 'Our grief for this paper was very great,' they wrote, 'it was much worse than anything we expected; not only the hand of the worst English counsel, but that of James Graham also, and others of our evil countrymen, was visible therein.'[2] As a final effort they addressed a long remonstrance to Charles, who only replied that he was 'much unsatisfied' that his endeavours for a general union of parties were so 'undervalued and misinterpreted,' and with this answer the commissioners took their departure.[3]

Charles had now adopted a definite policy, and Montrose was ready with a scheme for the invasion of Scotland. He had already received considerable encouragement and some substantial aid from Ulefeldt, the Danish ambassador at the Hague,[4] to whom he was 'much endeared,' and in April he was empowered by Charles to treat with all kings, princes, and states, as his plenipotentiary. In May his commission of Lieutenant-General of Scotland was renewed, and that of Admiral of Scotland added to it. In June he received, at Breda, the King's written promise of adherence to him and to his plans: 'I have thought fit to signify to you by these that I will not determine anything touching the affairs of that kingdom (Scotland) without having your advice

[1] *Diary of Brodie*, preface, xxiii. *Baillie*, iii. p. 516, May $\frac{19}{29}$, 1649; King's answer.

[2] *Ibid.*, iii. p. 516.

[3] *Baillie*, iii. p. 520, $\frac{\text{May } 23}{\text{June } 2}$, 1649.

[4] Cornifix Ulefeldt, favourite of Christian IV., was Ambassador-Extraordinary to the States-General in 1649.

thereupon.'[1] This assurance was accompanied by a renewal of all Montrose's 'trusts and commissions,' and, thus armed, he set forth on his quest of men and money in the northern Courts of Europe.

About the same time Cottington, prompted by the Prince of Orange, offered to go on a similar errand to Madrid, if Hyde would accompany him thither. The design of the Prince was merely to remove Hyde from the councils of the King,[2] but the suggested project found favour in the eyes of Charles and of the proposed ambassadors. Cottington was old, weary of his position in Holland, disliked in France, and very ready to return to Spain, where he had passed his youth. Hyde recognised the urgent need of money, and regarded Spain as the only source whence it could be obtained.[3] He too was glad of escape from an unpleasant position, in which he met with perpetual annoyance and difficulty. In March he had drawn up a declaration for the King, embodying a definite scheme of policy, in which pardon was offered to all who had had no share in the trial and death of the late King, and differences of religion were referred to a national synod to which foreign divines were to be invited. But when he read his declaration at the council board it was received in deep silence, and no two persons who saw it were of the same opinion concerning it. Dr. Stewart professed himself 'so exceedingly grieved' by the clause about foreign divines that he was unable to sleep at night for the thought of it, and no arguments of Hyde could convince him that, since the English Parliament was not likely to accept the overture, no harm could be done. In great agony of mind he implored the King never to sanction the document, and on one ground or another nearly every one else opposed it, so that it was at last abandoned.[4] Hyde was forced to

[1] *Napier*, ii. p. 706. King to Montrose, 22nd June 1649.
[2] Gardiner's *Commonwealth*, i. p. 70.
[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 4. Hyde to Nicholas, 4th May 1649.
[4] *Clarendon*, *History*, xii. pp. 41-6.

own himself defeated, and though the final rejection of the Scottish terms was a virtual triumph for his policy, he did not feel himself secure, and welcomed the thought of a respite from the trials and worries that daily beset him. Ere long he was destined to discover that though the office of ambassador 'in a time of peace and plenty' may be pleasant enough, 'yet, under a necessitous and unfortunate Prince it is hardly supportable, and it is a more decent thing to be ragged and starve in a vault than upon a stage.'[1] But in the beginning he went gladly enough. 'I must confess,' he wrote to Nicholas, 'Sir Edward Hyde is not troubled to be sometime absent from this company.'[2] And the company in question—that part of it at least which still yearned for a Presbyterian alliance—was glad to be rid of him. Montrose, on the contrary, regarded his departure as a desertion of himself which he could never pardon, nor was he the only Royalist who attributed the shame and misfortune that overtook their party in the following year to the 'unskilfull and unnecessary' absence of Sir Edward Hyde.[3]

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xl. fol. 184. Hyde to Lady Morton, 8th September 1650.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 124, 6th April 1649.

[3] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 322, 13th October 1649. Nicholas to Ormonde.

CHAPTER VI

Charles leaves Holland — Mademoiselle — Strained Relations of Charles and Henrietta—Influence of Elliot—Factions—Charles goes to Jersey.

1649 June

CHARLES had at last made up his mind to join Ormonde in Ireland, and the only question that remained to be decided was whether or no he should pass through France and visit his mother by the way. This the party represented by Hyde earnestly opposed. Such a course would, they considered, involve much waste of precious time and unnecessary expense, besides being somewhat derogatory to the dignity of the King, who had received, as yet, no message from France. And over and above these reasons there remained the ever-present dread of the Queen's pernicious influence on the counsels of her son. Her not unnatural anxiety to see him was regarded as a plot of Jermyn's. 'His present endeavour is to procure a speedy meeting between the King and Queen, here in France, to engage and tie up the King as much as ever his father was to the counsell of the Queen: and the horrid consequence of that, though but in reputation abroad, I leave to your consideration,'[1] wrote Hatton from Paris. Hyde, on his part, feared lest she should insist on going also to Ireland. 'My hope is that when we come to Ireland, Marquess Ormonde will be most hearkened to,' he wrote, 'but if the Queen go thither, what then? You cannot imagine the care that hath been taken to infuse prejudice into the King of all his father's council; and I believe he hath received some rebuke for admitting my Lord Keeper (Richard

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 116.

Lane) to the council, for he told me this day he was very sorry he did it.'[1] And about a month later the Chancellor wrote again in the same strain: 'The saddest thing to me in our business is that those about the Queen have learnt so much to dissemble that we know not how to trust. I do foresee that for some time the Queen will govern all, but it will not last long.'[2]

Hyde's disapproval was, however, unavailing. The Prince and Princess of Orange, naturally anxious to gratify the Queen, urged Charles to name a place of meeting to her, and the Prince offered to send two ships of war to await the King at any French port he might choose.

Charles, still irresolute, despatched his heavy luggage with his menial servants for Ireland, so that, if he went to France, he could do so unencumbered. Two ships thus loaded reached Ireland in safety, but, on the return journey, after the King had changed his plans, 'most of the persons and all the goods miscarried.'[3] Meanwhile Hyde and Cottington started on their Spanish mission, and, at Antwerp, encountered Lord Jermyn, bound for the Hague. Jermyn was charmed to find that his rivals had already left it, believing 'that he should more easily prevail with the King in all things, as indeed he did.'[4] Charles had by this time obtained £5000 from Rupert, the proceeds of prizes captured at sea, and the States, in their anxiety to be rid of their guest, lent him secretly £20,000. 'Were it not for the moneys which the Prince of Orange furnishes the King with, being underhand provided by the States, he had been still becalmed here,' declared Hyde's secretary.[5]

But the facile Charles, thus provided with means, and deprived of his most valued councillors, was easily won over by Jermyn to do the Queen's bidding. On June 10th, leaving his servants to complete the necessary pre-

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 123-4, 6th April 1649.
[2] *Clarendon Papers*, iii. p. 3, 4th May 1649.
[3] *Clarendon*, *History*, xii. p. 23.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 49.
[5] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 125. Edgeman to Nicholas, 25th May 1649.

parations, he set out, accompanied by the Prince and Princess of Orange, the Queen of Bohemia, one or two of her daughters, and others. At Delft and Rotterdam he was royally received by the magistrates of the city, and at Breda, where they all remained for some days, the Prince of Orange gave a *fête* in the King's honour.[1] From Breda Charles continued his journey, escorted only by the Prince with forty troops of horse, as far as Antwerp, where, as he was now on Spanish territory, his brother-in-law took leave of him.

At Antwerp he was met by 'a very rich coach, with six horses,' sent to him by the courteous Archduke Leopold, and in this he entered the city, where he was well received.[2] After a stay of two days he went on to Brussels, and there also he was civilly received by the Count of Pignoranda and other officers of the Archduke, who was himself absent with the army. But more than civility Charles could not obtain. Spain was poor, sorely hampered by her war with France, and not in the least inclined to help a king who was about to join his French mother at the French Court. His stay at Brussels was longer than he had intended, for the siege of Cambrai barred his route, but in a few days, the siege being opportunely raised, he passed on to Valenciennes, where he had a short interview with the Archduke, and thence continued his journey through France. At Péronne he was met by the Duc de Vendôme, who came to offer him lodgings at St. Germains, and to invite him to visit the French Court on his way thither. He accepted the invitation as in duty bound, and accompanied Vendôme to Compiègne, where the Court then was. There, besides the Queen and her sons, who received him with much affection, he found his uncle Gaston and his cousin 'Mademoiselle.' This lady was expecting his arrival with mingled feelings, for of late his suit had been vigorously renewed, and this time it had found support in powerful quarters.

[1] Green's *Princesses*, vi. p. 153.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 134.

ANNE MARIE LOUISE DE MONTPENSIER,
"LA GRANDE MADEMOISELLE."

From the engraving by Moncornet in the British Museum.

In May Lord Percy had come from Holland seeking leave for Charles to visit France, and bearing also many messages of compliment to Mademoiselle ; and at the same time Henrietta had sent Jermyn to press for her brother's consent to the union of her son with his daughter. Gaston, undecided as usual, laid the arguments for and against the marriage impartially before his daughter, but his favourite, La Rivière, argued vehemently in the English King's favour, pointing out that no other *parti*, suitable for Mademoiselle, was left in Europe. Even the Queen and Cardinal now took up the cause. Mazarin assured the girl that a great part of England and the whole of Ireland were yet in Charles's power, and that France was about to assist him vigorously ; while the Queen-Regent, protesting that she loved her niece as a daughter, declared that this marriage could only be for her happiness, since Charles was 'passionately in love' and his mother 'the best person in the world.'

Mademoiselle, pressed on all sides, replied that she would obey her elders, though she knew very well that the affairs of France, foreign and domestic, were such as made her quite unable to aid Charles. But neither the Queen nor her father put much faith in her seeming submission, and both frankly informed Jermyn that he must not depend upon them : 'For she does only what she chooses, and we have no power over her.'

Jermyn acted on this hint, opened negotiations with the lady herself, and, perceiving that she wavered, pressed hard for a positive answer. He told her that Charles was about to pass through France on his way to Ireland, where his presence was urgently needed, and that, if she would consent to be his wife, he would spend two days in Paris, marry her, and then leave her to lead her accustomed life at Court while he went forth to seek his fortune.

The high-spirited girl retorted that such was not her conception of conjugal duty. Once married to the King, she would share his wanderings, or dwell in sad retire-

ment with his mother, for she could have no heart for gaiety while her husband was in daily peril, nor could she live in luxury while he lacked bread. 'I should not be able to refrain from selling all my property and hazarding it to reconquer his realms,' she declared. And she resolved also that, if she must, sooner or later, marry the King of England, she would do so while he was still in misfortune; 'because, in that condition, he will have obligations to me, and, on being restored to his states, will consider me as the cause of it, by the succours that he will have received from my house, on my account.'

Yet, lacking the affection by which sacrifices are made easy, she shrank from the contemplation of her own magnanimity.

'These thoughts frightened me a little,' she says, 'because, having been all my life rich and happy, such reflexions overwhelmed me.' And she fled to her step-mother at Amiens, knowing that she was averse to the match, and would use her influence with Gaston against it. To Amiens Jermyn pursued her, full of compliments and beautiful speeches, made in the name of the absent suitor. Mademoiselle, driven desperate, fell back on religion as a last resource. For love of Henrietta she could overlook Charles's poverty and position, but never his heresy. 'Religion is a thing that one cannot let pass, and if he cares for me he ought to overcome this difficulty, and I would overcome many on my side.'

Jermyn pointed out that his admission into the Roman communion would exclude Charles for ever from his hereditary dominions, and retired, after a long dispute, happy in the belief that the lady would speedily yield to his master's suit.[1]

And, in truth, Mademoiselle began to resign herself to the apparently inevitable, and to derive what comfort she could from the situation. The idea of being seriously wooed did not displease her.

[1] *Montpensier*, i. pp. 218-20.

'I am dying to hear him say sweet things (*douceurs*) to me,' she confessed to La Rivière, 'for I do not know what it is like, no one having ever dared to say them to me; not on account of my rank, for they have frequently been said to queens of our acquaintance, but on account of my character, which is very far removed from *coquetterie*. But without being a coquette, I may very well listen to a king who seeks me in marriage; therefore I very much wish that he would say them to me.'

Such was her state of mind when Charles's approach to Compiègne was announced to her by the Queen with: 'Voilà votre galant qui vient.' The Court had risen early to meet him in the forest and bring him back to Compiègne for dinner, and, early though it was, Mademoiselle had made a careful toilet, and had even had her hair elaborately curled, a vanity which she did not usually affect. The Queen was amused by this evidence of weakness on the part of her dignified niece and cried gaily as she entered the coach: 'Ah, it is easy to know people who expect their lovers! See how she is got up!' Mademoiselle, vexed at the raillery, flushed with annoyance, and smart retorts rose to her lips, which she with difficulty repressed. With the romance of the Queen's love for the first Duke of Buckingham in her mind, she longed to reply that those who had had lovers of their own were doubtless quick to observe these signs in others, but that since *her* lover sought her in marriage, she had every right to adorn herself for the meeting. Prudence, however, prevailed, and she kept silence.

About a league beyond Compiègne they met Charles, and all alighted from the coach to salute him. Again Mademoiselle was favourably impressed with his appearance and inwardly decided that, if his mind only corresponded to his person, she would accept his hand. He had not, however, been many minutes in her company before he contrived to shock her by his apparent levity. The little King Louis chattered to him eagerly, asking

questions about hunting in Holland, and about the dogs and horses of the Prince of Orange, to all of which Charles answered readily in French. Then the Queen began to make inquiries about his affairs, and he became suddenly silent. She pressed him with further questions on serious subjects, and he answered nothing at all, excusing himself at last by saying he did not 'understand' French.

'From that moment I resolved not to conclude the marriage,' says Mademoiselle, 'conceiving a very bad opinion of a King, who, at his age, did not interest himself in his own affairs.' And here she certainly did Charles an injustice, for all his life he was accustomed to hide his graver designs beneath a mask of inconsequent frivolity, and his silence on this occasion may well have been due to reserve and discretion rather than to indifference.

At dinner the delicate susceptibilities of Mademoiselle sustained another shock. Charles possessed an insular appetite, and, neglecting the ortolans, he 'threw himself upon an enormous piece of beef, and a shoulder of mutton, as if there had been nothing else.' His cousin blushed for his vulgarity. 'His taste did not appear to me delicate, and I was ashamed,' she concludes in disgust.

After dinner the Queen withdrew, good-naturedly leaving the supposed lovers alone together, and Charles, far from using this grand opportunity, deliberately threw away his last chance. The bride-elect, already alienated by his levity and his appetite, was now doomed to be disappointed of the long-expected flattery and tender speeches. For a dreadful quarter of an hour, which seemed to both like years, her suitor sat beside her absolutely silent. She tried to attribute this speechlessness to the intensity of his reverence for her, but ardently wished that he could feel a little less. At last, unable to endure the situation longer, she called M. de Comminges to join them, and he happily succeeded in loosening

Charles's tongue. De La Rivière tried to soothe the injured lady by whispering that her cousin had never ceased to gaze at her, but she retorted sharply that it would be much more to the point if he spoke to her. Then, in despair, she turned to him and began to ask after various English people of her acquaintance. To these questions she contrived to extract brief answers, but *point de douceurs*.

Soon, to the relief of all concerned, the Queen put an end to the interview, and Charles was escorted, as before, some way into the forest, where his relatives took leave of him. He made his adieus first to the King and Queen, then, compelled by Jermyn, he approached Mademoiselle and said formally: 'I believe that M. Jermyn, who speaks better than I do, has explained to you my intentions and desires. I am your very obedient servant.'

Mademoiselle was deeply offended, and replied in exactly the same terms: 'I am your very obedient servant.' Jermyn, doubtless inwardly exasperated, poured forth the compliments that should have come from his master. Charles bowed silently, and so ended the meeting from which the heiress of Montpensier had hoped so much.[1]

It may be that the bright eyes and merry wit of the Palatine Sophie still dwelt in Charles's memory, or perhaps the fair Henrietta of Orange had already won his heart. But, whatever the reason, it is impossible to conclude otherwise than that he neither wished nor intended to marry his wealthy cousin. He had come to France for fifteen days, but remained three months, and during all that time he saw Mademoiselle only once. But, when she came to take leave of him, ere his departure for Jersey, Henrietta, far from despairing, at once returned to the charge. She received her niece with sarcastic congratulations on the death of the Empress. 'We must rejoice with you. Surely, though you have failed once, you cannot fail a second time.'

[1] *Montpensier*, i. pp. 223-6.

1649 September

Mademoiselle replied gravely that she no longer sought that alliance, whereupon Henrietta pointed to her son, saying: 'Here is a man who thinks a King of eighteen better than an Emperor of fifty with four children. But,' she continued, 'my son is too poor and wretched for you.' She pursued the conversation in this taunting vein for some time, then, softening suddenly, she drew her niece into the inner room, and, closing the door, said quickly: 'The King, my son, has begged me to ask your pardon if the proposal made to you at Compiègne has displeased you. He is in despair about it, and the thought of it haunts him. I did not wish to undertake this commission, but he implored me so earnestly that I could not refuse. I am of your opinion, you would be miserable with him, and I love you too much to wish—though it would have been for his happiness—that you should share his ill-fortune. All I can hope for is that his journey may be prosperous, and that afterwards you will be willing to accept him. That, to my mind, would be the crowning-point of his good fortune.'

To all this Mademoiselle replied respectfully, without committing herself, and, on returning to the other room, she announced her intention of going to visit her little step-sisters in the convent of St. Dominique at Poissy.[1] James of York immediately volunteered to accompany her, and she accepted his offer readily, being really fond of the boy, whom she infinitely preferred to his elder brother. 'He was then,' she says, 'a young prince of thirteen or fourteen years, very pretty, well made, with good features, fair, who spoke French well, which gave him a much better air than had the King, his brother, for, to my mind, nothing so disfigures a man as inability to talk.'[2]

But she was not allowed to enjoy his society alone, for Charles expressed a desire to be also of the party, and Henrietta thereupon agreed to join it as chaperon. All

[1] *Montpensier*, i. pp. 233-4. [2] *Ibid.* p. 211.

entered Mademoiselle's coach together, and throughout the drive, which lasted two or three hours, Henrietta discoursed incessantly on the subject of Charles's potential marriage, and of what a devoted husband he would make. Charles chimed in dutifully, saying that he could not understand how a man, having a reasonably pleasing wife, could permit his thoughts to stray after another woman, and that any amour in which he might himself indulge would be certainly extinguished by marriage; a speech on which his later life is sufficient commentary. Mademoiselle considered the whole conversation forced and affected, and found it, personally, very embarrassing. She rejoiced therefore that the Stuart party decided to spend the night at Poissy, and was glad to be able to return alone to Paris. Charles conducted her to her coach with formal compliments, but still made her no lover-like speeches. Two years elapsed ere they met again. Henrietta, however, never ceased to talk of her son's hopeless devotion, even though she knew that her niece—notwithstanding her denial—was making a last attempt to secure the Emperor, now, for the second time, a widower. The attempt failed, as the previous one had done, and the would-be bride consoled herself in her humiliation with the reflection that the Emperor was unworthy of possessing her. 'God, who is just, would not give such a wife as myself to a man who did not deserve me.'[1]

When Charles joined his mother at St. Germains she was in no good-humour. The recent fiasco at Compiègne, of which she had doubtless a full account from Jermyn, had occasioned her the keenest disappointment, and she had also other grounds of complaint against her son.

From the time he left Jersey till February 1649 Charles had been a mere pawn in the game; but the death of his father had opened a new era in his career, and this his mother was slow to realise. She had left the con-

[1] *Montpensier*, i. p. 303.

1649 July vent, whither she had retired in her first agony of sorrow, because she conceived her advice and guidance to be indispensable to the new King; and her first message had summoned him to her side and forbade him to swear any of his council until he had spoken with her.[1]

But Charles was now in his nineteenth year, a king in his own right. Before Henrietta's letter reached him his councillors were sworn. He proceeded to follow the advice of those councillors with very little reference to his mother's wishes, and he made no haste to France, whence he had received no message of condolence on his father's death.

To such a woman as Henrietta this attitude was galling beyond measure. She was deeply chagrined that he should have decided upon going to Ireland without asking her advice; she was vexed that her mandate concerning the council had been ignored, and angry about the embassy to Spain.

Yet for a while all this was forgotten in the bitter renewal of her grief occasioned by the sight of her eldest son, and the first days of their reunion passed 'in tears and lamentations.' But, when Henrietta at last turned her mind to business, she found her son grown suddenly and strangely reserved. He had left her Prince of Wales, he came back to her the King, and he neither apologised for having slighted her wishes, nor promised to regard them in future. She desired to have the Lords Bristol, Digby, and Hatton, with Sir Edward Nicholas, added to the council, and he put her off with an excuse. She wished Digby—who was just then 'in a very straight tie of friendship' with Jermyn—to be re-established as Secretary of State, and Charles refused curtly.[2] It was not usual to deprive the Secretaries of their places on the demise of the Crown, and Digby, much surprised, withdrew to Paris, where he 'breathed out his griefs' to Hyde. Hyde, who feared Digby's 'madness,' felt only relief; but the Queen was extremely angry, and she

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 128. [2] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 259, 303.

argued, reproached, and expostulated with vehemence.[1] Then at last Charles spoke plainly, telling her that in future he intended to 'obey his own reason and judgment,' and, in short, 'did as good as desire her not to trouble herself in his affairs.' The excitable Queen, used to the tender deference of the late King, lost her temper, and Charles thereupon quitted her presence abruptly, seeming thenceforth 'not to desire to be so much in her company as she expected.'[2]

Henrietta attributed this 'unexpected behaviour' of her son to the influence of Thomas Elliot, a groom of the Bedchamber, who had come from England to the Hague after Hyde's departure thence. Elliot was a friend of Rupert, consequently an enemy of Digby, and he had been on terms of intimacy with the young Prince of Wales and his Palatine cousins in former days at Oxford. The elder Charles, distrusting his influence, had removed him from attendance on the Prince of Wales when he went west in 1645, but now he received a warm welcome from the new King for the sake of old times. Elliot, 'being one who would receive no injury from his modesty,' made the most of his favour with his master. He was a bold, plain-spoken man, imbued with little reverence for the Queen, and he hung constantly about the King, whispering in his ear, telling him who was popular, and who unpopular in England, urging him to discountenance Lord Digby, and protesting that 'it would lose him more hearts in England than any other thing if he were thought to be governed by his mother.' He 'used the Queen with wonderful neglect,' and within a month of his arrival at Court was 'looked upon as very like to become the favourite.'

His position was strengthened by his marriage with the daughter of Mrs. Wyndham, who had been Charles's nurse, and for whom Charles entertained so strong an

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 4. *Clarendon*, *History*, xii. pp. 60-1.

[2] *Clarendon*, *History*, xii. p. 60.

affection that Elliot had no difficulty in obtaining from his master a promise to make Colonel Wyndham Secretary of State.

Such was the condition of affairs when Hyde and Cottington, who had been some time delayed at Brussels, arrived at Paris on their way towards Spain. They had been prepared for the situation by Digby, and Hyde was not much surprised when, immediately on his arrival, he was seized upon by the King, who poured into his ear the tale of the Queen's 'ill-humour,' and of all that had passed between them, except in the matter of Wyndham, about which he kept a discreet silence. Nor did the Chancellor fail to note that his young master's story was couched 'in a more exalted dialect than he had been accustomed to use.'

From the King Hyde proceeded to the Queen, to whom he found his arrival more grateful than he could have hoped. She received him graciously; regretted the embassy on which he was bound, and which would be, she assured him, fruitless; and lamented his departure from the King, 'not only because she thought he understood the business of England better than anybody else, but because she knew he loved the King and would always give him good counsel towards his living virtuously, and she thought he had more credit with him than any other that would deal with him honestly and plainly.' Passing on to her own affairs, she remarked that though she did not flatter herself that he bore her much affection, she was sure he would wish the King's conduct towards her to be 'fair and respectful,' and, essaying to speak of her husband's confidence in him, she suddenly burst into tears. Hyde was moved by a distress for which he well could feel, and soothed her as best he might, winning from her, bit by bit, the story of her son's 'unkindness,' of the sharp and rude things he had said in her presence, and the worse things he had said out of it; of the great influence possessed by Elliot; and lastly, of the 'incredible design' of making Wyndham

Secretary of State. This Hyde was as anxious to prevent as was the Queen herself, knowing that Wyndham, though 'an honest gentleman,' was 'extreme unequal to that province, towards which he could pretend no better qualification than that his wife had been nurse to the Prince who was now King.'[1]

With the Queen's permission, therefore, the Chancellor remonstrated with Charles, endeavouring to bring him to a better frame of mind, but without much success. The King protested that he desired to live on good terms with his mother, and only avoided her company because 'she grieved him by some importunities in which he could not satisfy her.' He would, he said, show her all duty and affection, 'as far as was consistent with his honour and the good of his affairs,' but reserve, and still more the semblance of it, was absolutely necessary. The dislike of Elliot, entertained by both his father and mother, he put down solely to the machinations of Digby, and about Wyndham he was obstinate. If the Colonel was ignorant of the duties of a Secretary, he could learn them; in a word, 'he was a very honest man, for whom he (the King) had never done anything, and he had not now anything to give him but this place.'[2] The wisdom of the Chancellor prevailed nothing, and it was old Lord Cottington who finally saved the situation with the powerful weapon of ridicule.

Cottington, then seventy-five years of age, had a gift of dry humour, and 'never smiled when he made others merry.' Confident in this power, he came one day to the King, when Hyde and many others were present, and said he had come to beg a favour for one of the late King's old servants. The man for whom he pleaded was, he said, 'one of the best falconers in England,' and had served the King's father for many years in that capacity. Here he branched off into a discourse on falconry, enlarging in technical terms on the great skill

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 60.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 62-3, 77, note.

1649 August

of the man in question, until Charles, growing impatient, asked what he could do for him. 'Well,' said Cottington, speaking very earnestly, and as if the matter were very near his heart, 'it is true that your Majesty keeps no falcons, and the poor man is grown old and cannot ride as he used to do; but he is a very honest man, and can read very well, and has as audible a voice as a man need have, wherefore I beseech your Majesty to make him your chaplain.'

The King, perceiving a jest, looked at him with a questioning smile, and Cottington went on with the same earnest gravity: 'I do assure your Majesty the falconer is, in all respects, as fit to be your chaplain as is Colonel Wyndham to be Secretary of State.' At this unexpected climax the bystanders burst into uncontrollable laughter, and the King, blushing deeply, turned away in silence. The story went the round of the Court, and was told 'merrily in all companies,' until Wyndham was ashamed of his candidature for an office so ill-suited to him, and Charles—too young to appreciate a laugh against himself—relinquished his design in sheer fear of ridicule.[1]

The whole summer passed in similar 'contestations.' The Queen talked much 'of retiring into a convent, and consequently having no more to do in the King's business.' But she delayed to carry out her threat, and in the autumn her influence began to revive.

'There is here at this instant (*sic*) whether the Lord Jermyn and his faction, or Tom Elliot and Sir Edward Herbert, who are of Prince Rupert's party, shall have the chief interest in the management of the King's affairs,' wrote Nicholas to Ormonde. 'The first, by the advantages of this place, have yet the better of it, but it is believed that when the King goes hence, especially if he go not for Jersey, that the other party will get the helm into their hands. In the meantime nothing is settled or acted by sad and serious counsels, but by catches, and

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 64.

on occasion, to the heart breaking of all knowing men that are faithful to the King.'[1]

Ormonde had no consolation to offer, for he had found his own task even more difficult than he had anticipated. He had hoped that the horror occasioned by the late King's death might prove a bond of cohesion, that would unite Irish Celts, Catholic Confederates, Irish Protestants, and Scots in one cause, but it was not to be. Inchiquin's Protestants hung back from the union with 'Papists,' the Ulster army of O'Neil refused to accept a peace denounced by the Papal Nuncio, and the Scottish forces held out for the Covenant, rejecting Ormonde's Papists and Monk's 'Sectaries' with equal severity. Rupert, blockaded by Blake at Kinsale, could give no help, Ormonde's army was starving, and on August 2nd, 1649, he was routed by the English at Rathmines, and the siege of Dublin raised. A fortnight later Cromwell landed at Dublin with reinforcements from England.

In the face of all these disasters it seemed madness for the King to proceed to Ireland. He himself was still anxious to go thither, protesting that his present life was too 'shameful' for endurance, and that he desired no better than 'to die' beside his faithful lieutenant, but cooler counsels prevailed.[2] Jermyn represented that there was so strong a Parliamentary fleet at sea as made it most unlikely that the King would ever reach Ireland at all, and persuaded him to postpone his journey thither until the storms of autumn drove home the hostile fleet. Yet in France Charles would not stay, knowing, as he did well, 'that his absence was impatiently desired' by the Court. After his first reception he had been practically ignored, and the English exiles had remained at St. Germains unsought by the French nobility. 'Why wonder at their solitude!' exclaims Madame de Motteville bitterly. 'Misfortune was of their company, they had no benefits to confer.' At the end of August, after the triumphant return of the Court to Paris, they were visited

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 306. [2] *De Motteville*, iii. p. 333.

1649 September

by the Queen-Regent, who spoke a few words of condolence, and then hastened to talk of ordinary subjects, in pity to Henrietta's grief. But the kindness of the Regent—which, to do her justice, never failed—could not atone for the coldness of the general atmosphere.[1] Charles was determined to depart, and his mother, finding his society not at all agreeable, and hoping to win the favour of Mazarin by freeing him from her son, was willing to let him go.

The only refuge that now offered was Jersey, where the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir George Carteret, still held out for the King, and thither Charles decided to return. Accordingly he wrote to the Prince of Orange, begging him to let his promised warships ride before St. Malo, ready to sail for Ireland when the time came, and on the 12th of September he and his brother set out from St. Germains with six coaches, sixty horses, and many servants and gentlemen—some of whom were forced to march on foot—in his train. At Caen he halted to visit Lady Ormonde, who dwelt there with her children; at Coutances he was met by the Bishop of that city, who took him in his own coach to the palace, where he lodged him for the night. Not content with this hospitality, the Bishop accompanied the party next day to Cotainville, where he had provided a banquet and music in the King's honour. Unfortunately the boats from Jersey were already awaiting the royal train. Most of the company would fain have tarried for the feast, but James of York insisted on embarking at once, pointing out that the direction of the wind would prevent pursuit from Guernsey, and that so favourable an opportunity should not be neglected. At noon, therefore, on the 17th of September 1649, Charles entered his own pinnace of eighteen oars, and at four o'clock in the afternoon he again set foot in Jersey.[2]

[1] *De Motteville*, iii. pp. 322, 329.

[2] Hoskins, *Charles II. in the Channel Islands*, ii. pp. 308-9.

CHAPTER VII

The Winter in Jersey—Preparations of Montrose—New Overtures from Scotland—Charles's Letters to Montrose—The Journey to Breda—Hopes from England—The Treaty of Breda—Royalist Dissensions—Advice of William II.—Defeat and Death of Montrose—Charles threatens to break the Treaty—Sails for Scotland—Makes last Concessions and takes the Covenant.

1649 September-November

THE winter passed uneventfully in Jersey, but the change of residence was undoubtedly pleasant to the young Stuarts, who, after three years of exile and dependence, now found themselves again within their hereditary dominions and surrounded by an affectionately loyal population.

The faithful islanders had welcomed their returning Princes gladly. They were charmed to see the tall, graceful, young King, whose deep mourning and melancholy dignity gave fresh stimulus to their loyalty. And still more were they charmed with the Duke of York, who was then fifteen, almost as tall as his elder brother, handsomer and of livelier manners.[1]

The brothers wandered freely about the island, made frequent shooting expeditions with their dogs, and readily accepted any hospitality offered to them. On Sundays they attended church at St. Heliers, rowing over thither, regardless of wind and rain, and, on the 31st of October, they held a grand review of all the native troops, which included all the men capable of bearing arms between the ages of fifteen and sixty. Moreover, Charles was lavish with such things as he had to give, and immunity

[1] *Hoskins*, ii. p. 324. Chevalier's *Journal*.

from irksome liabilities, or alterations of land tenures, were freely granted to all who chose to ask. The people were delighted with their new Sovereign's amiability and with the confidence he showed in them.

Yet his sojourn in the island was not without inconvenience. He had brought with him an enormous train, which included most of the lords and gentlemen who had been at the Hague or in France, besides chaplains, physicians, servants, and the usual number of tradesmen. This company, too large to be accommodated in Castle Elizabeth with the King, had to find quarters in the town and even in the rural districts. St. Aubin's was crowded with the crews and captains of privateers; food and forage ran short, and the strangers fought and quarrelled among themselves until the King was forced to declare death the penalty of duelling.

Carteret met the difficulty of procuring food-supplies by proclaiming free trade with France, and he enabled Charles to raise a new loan in the island by generously paying off the old one from his private resources.[1] Some small sums of money the King obtained from English loyalists,[2] and yet his wants were, as usual, 'incredible.'[3] He was reduced to selling the royal demesne in Jersey, much to the vexation of Jermyn, whose profits as titular governor were thereby diminished. 'One of the last shifts to buy bread is the selling of a parcel of Crown-lands worth £200 per annum, of which Lord Jermyn had the patent,' wrote one of Charles's gentlemen. 'The King and the Duke have a few dishes, the reversion of which is assigned to a set number of waiters; the rest are on board wages, to be paid when money is sent.'[4]

Poverty, and the ever-present danger from the ships of the Parliament, made a long stay in Jersey impossible, and yet no other refuge seemed open. Byron was of opinion that the King should go to Ireland at all risks, 'that he may come at least while he hath something left

[1] *Hoskins*, ii. pp. 314-64.
[2] *Ellis, Letters*, 2nd series, iii. p. 351.
[3] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 313.
[4] *Clarendon Papers*, 22nd Nov. 1649.

to fight for, and not be taken here in a nook of the world with his hands in his pockets.'[1]

But Charles waited still for news from Ormonde, who had lost his cipher at Rathmines, and dared no longer write. On September 11th Drogheda fell, and the gallant defenders, the flower of Ormonde's army, were ruthlessly massacred by Cromwell's men, though it is more than unlikely that any one of them had had any share in the Ulster massacre of 1641, which Cromwell pretended thus to avenge.[2] A month later Wexford shared the fate of Drogheda; and Charles, dismayed by the reported disasters and by Ormonde's continued silence, sent one of his gentlemen, Henry Seymour, to seek the Lord-Lieutenant, and learn his opinion and advice on the present state of affairs. In the meantime it was rumoured that the King's inaction was injuring him in the eyes of foreign potentates.

'I find,' wrote Byron to Ormonde, 'that his stay here hath been so far from enabling him in any way, that it hath rather extremely increased his necessities, and that foreign princes begin to look upon him as a person so lazy and careless in his own business that they think it not safe, by contributing to his assistance, to irritate so potent enemies as they fear his rebellious subjects are like to prove.'[3]

Charles had, in any case, little enough to hope from foreign aid, and it was in Montrose that his hopes now chiefly rested. Before leaving St. Germains he had written to the Marquis, urging him to continue his efforts in the cause, and renewing his promises of support and confidence.

'I entreat you to go on with your wonted courage in the prosecution of those trusts committed to you, and not to be frustrated by any reports you may hear as if I were otherwise inclined to the Presbyterians than I was

[1] *Carte*, i. p. 320, 12th October 1649.
[2] See Gardiner's *Commonwealth*, i. p. 139.
[3] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 318.

before I left you. I assure you I am still upon the same principles, and depend as much as ever upon your undertakings and endeavours for my business, being fully resolved to assist and support you to the utmost of my power.'[1]

Already Montrose was labouring in the northern Courts of Europe. At the end of August 1649 he visited the Duke of Friesland, who promised him free quarters for his men. Next he went to Hamburg, whence he sent envoys to solicit the aid of all the princes of the empire. At Holstein he met the King of Denmark, who received him kindly, but from the Danish nobles he could get no money. In November he sought the Queen of Sweden, Christina, daughter of the great Gustavus, but obtained from her little satisfaction. She had written to Charles in September, offering to join a league of princes for his assistance, but alone she would do nothing.[2] All that Montrose could wring from her was the grant of half the arms and ammunition that she had promised to Brentford in the spring—the other half was reserved for Ormonde. But at Gothenburg the Marquis found a generous friend in a Scottish merchant, resident there, who entertained him in his house, and advanced him £13,500.[3] About the same time he received a message from the Emperor to the effect that he desired to aid the King, and would treat with the Princes on that subject at the next Diet. The Duke of Courland 'nobly' contributed six ships of corn; the King of Poland promised to raise 4000 men at his own cost, and both he and his French wife, Marie de Gonzague, protested zeal for Charles's service, and regret that their own embarrassments made them unable to aid him further.[4] The Duke of Lorraine had refused his troops to Charles in the spring; but Count Waldemar of Denmark, the son of

[1] *Dom. State Papers*, R.O., Interreg., ii. fol. 109, 29th September 1649.

[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 307.

[3] Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i. pp. 212-13.

[4] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 345-51, 358-9. *Historical MSS. Com.*, Report 13, App. ii. vol. iii. p. 28.

Christian IV. by a morganatic wife, volunteered to raise an army if provided with £50,000 for the purpose; and a Hessian general, Von Karpfen, went to collect money in the Diet for an intended levy of his own of 4000 men.

Exaggerated reports of Montrose's preparations filled the Covenanters in Scotland with alarm, and the failure of Ormonde in Ireland, and the wretched condition of Charles in Jersey determined them to agree with their Sovereign while there was yet time. Argyle was, of course, far too intelligent a man to close his eyes to the danger attending the policy now adopted, but the nation desired its King, the tide of popular feeling could not be stemmed, and the Covenanting Marquis chose to go with it rather than relinquish the semblance of power. Accordingly he obtained a vote in Parliament for the sending of a new address to the King, and George Winram, Laird of Libberton, was appointed to be its bearer. The more rigid of the Covenanters raised their voices in protest, and accused Argyle of 'inclining to a new trinketting with the King by himself';[1] but they were powerless to defeat his purpose, and, after various delays and difficulties, Winram set out for Jersey about the middle of October. He was, for one of his faction, a moderate man, willing to conciliate Charles if possible, and, like others of his party, sure that if the King were only 'extricate from his wicked council,' all would be easy.

'Now is the time to pray that God the Lord will prevent the King with his tender mercies, for indeed he is broght verie low,' he wrote hopefully. 'He has not bread both for himself and his servands, and betwixt him and his brother not one English shilling, and wurse, if I durst write it, . . . soe that his case is very deplorable, being in prison where he is, living in penurie, surrounded by his enemies, and not able to live anywhere else in the world unless he would come to Scotland by giving them satisfaction to ther just demandis.

[1] *Baillie*, iii. p. 99, 14th September 1649.

1649 November-December

Yet his pernicious and devilish council will suffer him to starve before they will suffer him to take the League and Covenant.'[1]

The moment selected for Winram's mission was certainly propitious. Only three members of the 'devilish' council were with the King, and one of these —Robert Long—was already favourable to the Scots. The others, Nicholas and Hopton, though staunch to their original principles, had much to contend against.

Charles had reconciled himself with his mother on leaving France, and there was now such a 'perfect understanding' between them that he permitted her to open all letters that came for him to Paris.[2] This confidence in the Queen filled the councillors with apprehension, because, since the misfortunes in Ireland, Jermyn had turned his thoughts back to a Presbyterian alliance, and now circulated 'with great diligence and care' all reports likely to discredit the enterprises of Ormonde and Montrose.[3] Already he had won over to his views many of those about the King. 'The persons held as chief saints in the Presbyterian Calendar and devotion are Lord Percy, Lord Culpepper, Mr. Long, and Dr. Fraser,' declared Hatton, and he added that their influence was the greater 'by the advantage of the King's gentle and sweet nature and disposition or—to speak their own words—his Majesty's indifferency to all.'[4]

These, of course, urged Charles to make Winram welcome. On the other side some of the younger Royalists professed great indignation at the Scots' presumption, and threatened their envoy with personal violence. 'I believe he will think he hath made a good voyage if he escape with a broken pate. The gallants talkt, before I came away, of throwing him over the wall,' wrote Sir John Berkeley to Hyde.[5]

[1] *Baillie*, iii. p. 522, 8th-18th November 1649.
[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 319. [3] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 147.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 151-2. *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 322-3.
[5] Gardiner, *Charles II. and Scotland*, p. 3.

1650 January

But none of the opponents of the Scots had any better advice to offer than that the King should retire to Holland and there live 'as a private person' until Montrose or some one else wrought a miracle for him,[1] and Winram was, after all, courteously received. He had previously visited some of the English Presbyterians in Holland, and was provided with a list of London citizens who promised to contribute men and money if Charles would agree with the Scots.[2] And he was accompanied by Captain Silas Titus, who had formerly served the English Parliament and had transferred his devotion to the late King while acting as one of his guards at Carisbrooke.

But Charles was disappointed in the letter from the Committee of Estates, which was less conciliatory than the bearer himself could have wished, and for six weeks Winram awaited an answer in vain. He was almost ready to depart in despair when the return of Henry Seymour from Ireland changed the King's attitude.[3]

The report sent by Ormonde was of the gloomiest. Cromwell had swept victoriously southward, plague and famine devastated the country, the alliance between English and Irish had broken down, the Lord-Lieutenant was now wholly dependent on the Celtic population, and the great Owen O'Neil had died just at the moment when he agreed to join forces with Ormonde. An army of 5000 foot and 1300 horse remained faithful to the King, but there were no means to maintain it, and starvation stared in the face. 'Our wants having occasioned disorder, and that disorder the spoil of the country, and that spoil the flight of the country from us as from an enemy,' concluded the distracted Lord-Lieutenant.[4]

Charles perceived that he must either make terms with Argyle or rely solely on Montrose, and, according to the

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 326-7.
[2] Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i. p. 205.
[3] *Carte MSS.*, ccxiii. fol. 12.
[4] *Gardiner*, i. p. 161.

fatal habit of his family, he vacillated between the two courses.

First, to avoid an absolute breach with Argyle, it was necessary to furnish Winram with an answer to his message, and, immediately after Seymour's return, the King called to council, not only his three sworn councillors, but all the peers present in the island.

'I pray God your additional pilots of all the lords there with you in Jersey dash you not against a rock,'[1] exclaimed Hatton when informed of this step. It meant, in fact, defeat for Hopton and Nicholas. They, with Lord Gerard and the young Duke of York, were averse from treating with the Scots at all, but they were outnumbered by the other faction consisting of the Lords Cleveland, Wentworth, Percy, Byron, and Robert Long. The debate was hot and stormy, but the King, with 'such moderation, patience, and judgment as was admirable in a person of his years,' quieted the fierce passions of his advisers, repressed their mutual taunts and recriminations, and at last obtained a unanimous vote for a treaty with the Scots[2] 'on honourable terms.' Secretary Nicholas was, however, careful to leave on record his definition of an *honourable* treaty as being 'a treaty without prejudice' to Ormonde or Montrose.[3] And James of York revenged his defeat by dismissing Lord Byron and Sir John Berkeley from their places in his bedchamber. 'We could guess at no other reason than that we were calmly for that treaty which our master passionately opposed,'[4] declared Berkeley.

The treaty being agreed on, it remained to decide by what title Argyle's assembly should be addressed. The Scots had stipulated for its recognition as a legal Parliament, but it had not been called by regal authority, and it had continued to sit after the late King's death,

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 161, 5th-15th January 1650.
[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 339. Byron to O'Neil, 7th-17th February 1650.
[3] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 161, January 1650.
[4] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 120, 22nd March 1650.

so that Nicholas's party considered that this concession would be dishonourable to the present King, and 'of mischievous consequence.'[1] Others argued that 'the calling this a Parliament on the backside of a letter' would not make it one, and that it was folly to throw away substantial advantages for the sake of 'airy words and titles.' Finally it was settled to address the Assembly as the 'Committee of Estates,' which, said Byron, 'though the same thing in effect, yet avoids the odiousness of the word Parliament.'[2] 1650 January

The contents of the letter were less gratifying to the Covenanters than its superscription. Charles merely intimated his acceptance of their rather dubious loyalty, reiterated his earnest desire to see them united with Montrose and the Hamiltonians, and directed them to send commissioners to meet him at Breda by the fifteenth of March.[3]

With this answer Winram departed for Scotland.

On the following day Charles wrote three letters to Montrose. The first, which was accompanied by the George and ribbon of the Garter, appointed the Marquis a Knight and Companion of that Order, with suitable and complimentary phrases. The second contained a copy of the King's letter to the Committee of Estates, and an assurance 'that we will not before, or during, the treaty do anything contrary to the power and authority which we have given you by our commission, nor consent to anything that may bring the least diminution to it.' As before, Montrose was urged to continue his levies; 'as we conceive that your preparations have been an effectual motive that hath induced them to make the said address to us, so your vigorous proceedings will be a good means to bring them to such moderation in the said treaty as probably may produce an agreement and

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 342, 11th-21st February 1650. Nicholas to Ormonde.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 339, 7th-17th February 1650. Byron to O'Neil.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 355. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. App. xciii., 11th January 1650.

a present union of that whole nation in our service.'[1] And the letter concluded with an express permission to publish it if he thought fit.

The third letter was private, and contained passionate assurances of the King's confidence and affection.

'I will never fail in the effects of that friendship I have promised . . . and nothing that can happen to me shall make me consent to anything to your prejudice. I conjure you therefore not to take alarm at any reports or messages from others, but to depend upon my kindness and to proceed in your business with your usual courage and alacrity, which, I am sure, will bring great advantage to my affairs and much honour to yourself. I wish you all good success in it, and shall ever remain your affectionate friend, CHARLES R.

'JERSEY, 12*th*-22*nd January* 1649-50.'[2]

Montrose received none of these letters until two months later, when he was already upon Scottish ground; but his agent in Paris, to whom they were first delivered, promptly took advantage of the royal permission to publish them, in the hope of breaking the treaty with the Covenanters.[3] In this he nearly succeeded; the letter was already in print when Winram reached Edinburgh, and it was only by the exertion of all his power, and in face of fierce opposition, that Argyle succeeded in getting any commissioners sent to Breda at all.[4]

Charles, in the meantime, was preparing to meet them, and his first care was the renovation of his wardrobe. The clothes that he had with him were, he averred, 'so spotted and spoiled that they are not to be seen out of this island,' and he directed Edward Progers, one of his grooms of the Bedchamber, to procure him an 'embroidered sute,' with hat-band and belt, and 'a plain

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 357, 12th-22nd January 1650.
[2] *Napier*, ii. p. 752.
[3] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 368. Long to Ormonde, 2nd-12th March 1650.
[4] Gardiner, *Charles II. and Scotland*, p. 13.

riding sute with an innocent coate,' in order that he might make a decent appearance on the Continent.[1] The young Duke of York was to remain in Jersey, 'a prisoner to his brother's jealousie' the mischief-makers declared.[2] It is very likely that James's 'passionate' opposition to the treaty made Charles undesirous of his company, but there was no coldness in their parting. When Charles sailed for France on 13th-23rd February 1650, James came on deck to take leave of him, and embraced him three times, shedding bitter tears.[3] Doubtless the younger brother wept less for the loss of his elder's society than for the peril in which he deemed his Sovereign's honour placed. 1650 February

The Queen had bidden her son meet her at Beauvais before proceeding to Breda, and thither he hastened as quickly as 'foul weather and ill ways' would permit. At nine o'clock, on the morning of February 24th, N.S., he landed at Cotainville, and was welcomed by the hospitable Bishop of Coutances, at whose palace he passed the night. Three days later he was at Caen, where Lady Ormonde and Lady Isabella Thynne joined the royal train. At St. Lisieux Charles was again the guest of a bishop; at Rouen he was entertained by the Duc d'Elbœuf, and on Thursday, March 4th, he arrived at Beauvais, where he found the Queen awaiting him.[4] March

Mother and son met 'with great kindness on both sides'; they lodged in the same house—lent by one of the canons of the Cathedral—and dined at the same table; even Jermyn was included in the general amnesty. But it was soon evident to Henrietta that her son was withholding his confidence from her. She had come to urge him to make any terms with the Scots, short of taking the Covenant, but, though he heard her with due deference, he refused to recall Montrose's com-

[1] *Historical MSS.*, Report 10, App. iv. p. 147.
[2] *Charles II. and Scotland*, p. 25.
[3] *Hoskins*, ii. p. 376.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 377. *Trethewy's Journal.* *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 57.

1650 March missions, and maintained an irritating attitude of 'indifference' to all parties. To the Queen's anger against Wood—the agent who had published the letter to Montrose—he accorded no sympathy, and all the satisfaction she could gain was the removal of Wood from Paris by a summons to attend the King at Breda. In vain Henrietta persuaded her son to prolong his stay with her, in the hope of breaking through his reserve. At the end of a fortnight matters were as they had been from the first, and on the last day the Queen emerged from her final interview with Charles and Nicholas 'very red with anger.' Three hours later she set out for Paris, and it was noticed that her parting with the King was less affectionate than their greeting had been. 'They seemed to me to part but coldly,' wrote an English spy, 'for when the Prince had put her into her coach he did not stay one moment with her, but came presently (*i.e.* immediately) away from her.'[1]

On the same day, March 16th, Charles resumed his journey, being courteously received everywhere, until he reached Ghent on March 23rd. There the Governor offered the Castle for his accommodation, but Charles preferred to apply for quarters to the magistrates, who answered that there were many good inns in the town. At one of these, the Golden Apple, Charles took up his abode, and, in his anger at the slight offered him, he refused to receive the visit of the magistrates. The good burghers, who had intended no affront, then sent him word that it was their custom to present a pipe of Rhenish wine to all foreign princes lodging in their city, but that if he preferred the value of the gift in money it was at his service. This Charles received as a new insult, and his unfortunate visit to Ghent terminated next morning in a violent dispute with the innkeeper over his bill.

'Could we but have sworn and cursed in Walloon and Dutch as well as in English, the Flemings should

[1] *Charles II. and Scotland*, pp. 15-30. *Carte MSS.*, ccxiii. fol. 3.

have heard how we devoted them to the devil,' wrote one of the spies who followed the King everywhere.[1]

The extortions of the innkeeper and the haughty rejection of the burghers' assistance had left Charles penniless; but good fortune threw in his way an English merchant, who furnished him with £200, and by this timely loan he was enabled to continue his journey and to take boat for Breda,[2] where he arrived on March 26th.

The treaty of Breda marks the crisis in Charles's career. He was not, at this period, the cold-blooded traitor and hypocrite that he is sometimes represented, but a young man—hardly more than boy—very sorely tempted. A definite choice was laid before him: on the one side were honour, truth, and honesty, with poverty and exile; on the other, perjury, dishonour, and a kingdom. Conscience, the traditions of his childhood, the memory of his father, affection for his friends, bade him choose the first. An easy, self-indulgent nature, and the sophistries poured incessantly into his ears, drew him to the last. The downward path was not an easy one, and he did not sacrifice his friends or perjure himself with a light heart. Step by step he struggled desperately, yet yielded always, until at last he laid his honour in the dust and forfeited his self-respect for ever.

Warning voices were not wanting. On the first rumour of the treaty Hyde had written from Spain that the Scots would 'cozen' the King, and, when Berkeley replied flippantly that he thought that impossible, since the King had nothing to lose, the absent Chancellor rebuked his levity with the stern retort: 'When all is lost, we may be cozened of our innocency.'[3] In the same spirit wrote Sir Joseph Jane, the son-in-law of Secretary Nicholas: 'I think a man may without rashness or bigotry affirm that it's an ill exchange to

[1] *Charles II. and Scotland*, pp. 33-4.

[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 375. Nicholas to Ormonde, 3rd-13th April 1650.

[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 499-520, 3rd December 1649-18th March 1650.

gain a kingdom by rooting up religion and piety.'[1] And Lord Hatton averred that the Scottish terms were such as 'a noble spirit in a private person would not condescend to for an Empire,' adding, with his accustomed boldness, 'If the King desert Ormonde or Montrose, if he confirm the Scots Parliament or take the Covenant, God will never prosper him or the world value him.'[2]

Charles had, at the outset, no intention of doing any of these things. His private correspondence with Argyle had led him to believe that the Scots would not push things to an extremity; if, however, they proved impracticable, he was secretly resolved to steal away and join Montrose in the north.[3] There were also the prospective forces of Von Karpfen and Count Waldemar to fall back upon, and these might be used to assist a rising in England, where Royalism seemed to be reviving.

On the 28th of March, two days after his arrival at Breda, Charles received from a certain Colonel Keane a detailed report of the condition of the English Royalists. The West was still loyal, and the Arundels volunteered to raise 3000 foot and 200 horse in Cornwall, and to seize all the strong places in the county, if Sir Richard Grenvile were first sent to Scilly with a small force and some supply of arms and ammunition. The gentry of Hampshire, Dorset, Somerset, and Devon promised to raise 1000 horse and 8000 foot between them; and Sir Nicholas Crispe, with other London merchants, undertook to collect money on condition that no one—not even the King himself—asked the names of the contributors. They were willing 'to hazard all' in the King's service, and asked in return that he would promise toleration to Roman Catholics, and would join with Montrose rather than with Argyle, if a complete union of parties could not be effected. Further, they

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 137-8, 9th September 1649.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 165, 6th-16th January 1650.

[3] *Balfour*, iii. p. 417. *Charles II. and Scotland*, preface. *Carte MSS.*, ccxiii. fol. 14.

desired the royal permission to take 'the Engagement,' an oath to be faithful to the Commonwealth 'without King or Lords,' recently imposed by the Government on the whole male population, on pain of outlawry.[1]

Charles immediately appointed Lord Eythin Lieutenant-General to Montrose, and sent Keane back to England, authorised to make the required promises, and to refer all to the dictates of their own consciences as regarded the Engagement. It was eventually refused by most Royalists, 'and resolved to be broke by those that took it.'[2]

But, with all their loyal intentions, the Cavaliers were 'so poor, so disjointed, and so severely watched,' that they could effect little without the support of the Presbyterian party or the aid of a foreign army.[3] The Presbyterians were not unwilling to assist the King, on receiving assurance of indemnity for past offences; but they naturally inclined to Argyle and the Covenant, for which reason many Royalists preferred an alliance with the Levellers. The Levellers—an offshoot of the Independents—were bitterly dissatisfied with the rule of the army, which they stigmatised as an unjustifiable tyranny. They desired a free Parliamentary Government, with certain social and legal reforms, were tolerant in religious matters, and by no means irreconcilable to the King. Their leader, John Lilburne, had persistently denounced Cromwell and his methods, and had openly avowed: 'If we must have a King, I, for my part, would rather have the Prince than any man in the world because of his large pretence of right.'[4] The arrest of Lilburne in the autumn of 1649 had put the final touch to the alienation of his party from the Government, and for some time past

[1] *Keane's Memorial. Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. p. 9, 18th-28th March 1650.

[2] Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i. p. 269.

[3] Report of Herbert Price, *Dom. State Papers*, R.O., Interreg., ix. p. 9.

[4] *Gardiner*, i. p. 180.

the Levellers had been in correspondence with the Royalists.[1]

With his mind full of these schemes Charles came to meet the Scottish commissioners. They had arrived at Breda on Saturday, March 26th, within a few hours of the King himself, but he did not notice their presence until three days later, after the departure of Keane. On Tuesday, however, he sent his own coach to bring them to their first audience, and received them in his bed-chamber with every mark of courtesy.[2]

Argyle had done his best for Charles, but even his influence had not availed against the power of the Kirk. The three ministers sent by the General Assembly, and three of the Parliamentary commissioners — Brodie, Jaffray, and the Earl of Cassilis—had been chosen from the most rigid faction of the Covenanters. The others—Winram, Sir James Smith, and the Earl of Lothian—were of Argyle's own faction, and would willingly have made concessions to the King, but they were distrusted by their colleagues, and no latitude was allowed in their instructions. The terms laid before Charles on April 4th were as stringent as those that he had formerly rejected at the Hague.

He was to take the Solemn League and Covenant, to establish the Presbyterian form of worship and Church government in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and to permit no other within his own household. He was to recognise the legality of the Scottish Parliament, ratify its Acts, own its supremacy in all civil affairs, and submit all ecclesiastical questions to the decision of the Kirk. Finally, he was to enforce the penal laws against Roman Catholics, annul all treaties made with them, and recall all his declarations and commissions. In plain words, he was to absolutely abandon Ormonde and Montrose. The commissioners of the Kirk added much eulogy of the Covenant, heaped reproaches upon Charles for his

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 332.
[2] *Charles II. and Scotland*, pp. 39-40.

dealings with the Irish and with 'James Grahame,' and concluded with the pious observation, 'It will be your Majesty's wisdom to acknowledge the sin, and to humble yourself before God.'[1] 1650 April

These propositions were received by the Royalists with bitter indignation. They could, it was said, proceed only 'from brazen-faced rebels and barbarous bruites that never mean to have communication with men of honestie and reason.'[2] The King's chaplains spoke to him of honour and conscience; his faithful followers reminded him passionately of the sacrifices they had made in his cause, declaring that they were 'all undone for his sake,' and that if he now deserted them for the Scots he would go, like his father, to his own destruction.[3]

'There is no great danger of an agreement, . . .' wrote Berkeley to Hyde, 'for they are resolved to insist upon things unreasonable, and we are not in a disposition to grant them reasonable.'[4] And it was reported that the King's council would 'sooner break than bow to any agreement with the Scots.'[5]

On the other hand, the faction led by Jermyn and Percy urged Charles to consider well ere he broke for ever with Argyle. They pointed out that he was, as yet, bound by no oaths, and might therefore grant much that his father, sworn as he was to the English Church, could not grant.[6] They reminded him that his grandfather, Henri IV., had declared the kingdom of France to be well worth a Mass, adding that the kingdom of Scotland was surely worth the Covenant, and that it was 'needful sometimes to hold a candle to the devil.'[7]

Yet 'it was pretty to observe' how the very men who argued thus repudiated the name of Presbyterian, and

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. App. li.-liii., 25th March-4th April 1649.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 155.
[3] Gardiner, *Charles II. and Scotland*, p. 74.
[4] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 120.
[5] *Charles II. and Scotland*, p. 40.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 70.
[7] *Ibid.* pp. 69, 73.

when the word was applied to the Earl of Cleveland his colour rose, and 'he answered with an oth in his anger that whosoever called him a Presbyterian he would cane or beat him.'[1]

The Engagers, Hamilton and Lauderdale, who had come to be present at the treaty, beguiled the young King with a more subtle argument. They told him that his mere presence in Scotland would 'dissipate these clouds,' and that, once arrived in his faithful kingdom, he would not be held to the hard terms now offered him, but would find all his subjects compliant to his will.[2] The hope thus insinuated was carefully fostered by Lothian, Winram, and Smith. These three continually urged their colleagues not to press the King too hard, declared that commissioners must needs 'manage' their instructions, and hinted that more had been confided to them than was known to the others, though, when questioned, they were driven to own that their secret instructions were, 'only some words had been spoken by some prime men in some private conference.'[3] Nevertheless they were able to outvote the rest of the commission on all points, since Cassilis, as President, had no vote at all, and they did not hesitate 'to whisper up and down in their discourse that no such thing as the Covenant would be pressed.' This rumour Cassilis firmly refused to countenance, and when the Marquis of Newcastle visited him for the express purpose of discussing the Scottish terms, 'he was only rebuked for his customary swearing, and sent home with this good counsel to his conscience, but with not one word of satisfaction for the King.'[4]

It was, however, no part of Charles's policy to break off the treaty abruptly; on the contrary, he desired to prolong it until the success of Montrose or the wiles of Argyle should change the views of the Kirk. Therefore

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 155. [2] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 122.
[3] Livingstone's *Life*, Wodrow Society, i. pp. 173-6.
[4] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 155.

he delayed his answer to the commissioners, and excluded Nicholas and Hopton from his council because they persisted in stating their opinion 'that the King ought not to approve or allow of the Solemn League and Covenant of any sort, either in Scotland or in any other of his kingdoms.' They submitted to the slight with quiet dignity. 'If it be an offence to be zealous for the King's party, we are happy to be so excluded,' said Nicholas.[1] But the proceeding struck dismay to many hearts. 'God help us when Hamilton, Long, Newcastle, and Buckingham rule in council!' cried Hatton. 'Surely better were it his Majesty had given himself up to be governed by his mother, for natural affection and education might have pleaded for that.'[2]

Yet the King, though sorely torn and harassed among the contending factions by which he was daily and hourly besieged in presence chamber, bedchamber, even in his private rooms, was still far from any intention of taking the Covenant. His melancholy expression and the silence that was becoming habitual with him bore witness to his distress of mind. He 'perfectly hated the Presbyterians and all their ways,' and his heart was with Montrose; but it was long since he had heard of that gallant adventurer, and he needed time.[3] Therefore he conciliated the Scots as far as in him lay, forbade his chaplains to preach against the Covenant, and suffered the lengthy discourses of the Scottish ministers with exemplary patience. Once, however, he startled them with an abrupt denial of their contention that the Scriptures were 'ane perfect rule in those things controverted,' and the not inapt inquiry, 'how people knew it was the Word of God but by the testimony of the Church?' The scandalised ministers felt, thenceforth, less confidence in the King's seemingly 'courteous and tractable-like disposition'; they observed

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 379.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 173.

[3] *Charles II. and Scotland*, pp. 46, 53, 54. *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 155.

that he had never ceased from a devout attendance on the ministrations of his own chaplains, and they were not without suspicion of his feelings toward Montrose.[1] 'It is like the King come to Scotland whether we agree or not,' wrote one of them.[2]

An atmosphere of mutual distrust prevailed, and affairs were still in this state when the Prince of Orange came to Breda to mediate a compromise. The Scots had thought themselves 'cocksure'[3] of his alliance, but they were doomed to disappointment. He would not advise Charles to submit either English or Irish affairs to Scottish dictation, and only prompted him to offer recognition of the Scottish Parliament and maintenance of the Presbyterian Establishment with 'approval' of the Covenant in Scotland alone. This failed to satisfy the commissioners, and, after three days' conference, the Prince departed in anger, saying 'that he thought they intended little peace, and would so declare unto the world in behalf of his brother, who had condescended to all he could in honour. And he would be no mediator to him for a dishonourable peace whatsoever were his hazard.'[4] Charles himself 'brake out into a great passion and bitter execration' of the Scots, vowing that nothing would induce him to set foot in Scotland unaccompanied by his chaplains. The ministers retorted that they had found in him only 'lightness and vanity,' and all seemed at an end.[5] 'I can assure you all the Presbyterian party looked last night like drowned rats,' wrote a triumphant Cavalier.[6] The triumph was of brief duration. All Charles's hopes were slipping away from him. He had failed to obtain the money needed by Count Waldemar. Von Karpfen was jealous of Waldemar, and clamoured for repayment of the sums that

[1] Livingstone's *Life*, pp. 173-4. Wodrow Society Publications.
[2] Wishart, *Deeds of Montrose*, p. 300. *Charles and Scotland*, p. 45.
[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 155. Watson to Edgeman.
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] *Charles II. and Scotland*, p. 74.
[6] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 155.

he had expended in Charles's service. The Presbyterians of London sent a warning that they could not aid the King unless he agreed with Argyle. Cromwell was sweeping all before him in Ireland. Montrose was silent and his condition unknown. To make matters worse, the States had grown impatient of Charles's presence on their borders, and his support was a heavy burden on the embarrassed Prince of Orange, who was forced to pledge his town of Breda in order to raise money for his brother-in-law.[1] 1650 May

In this predicament Charles listened to the persuasions of Will Murray, Argyle's private agent, who had come to warn the King against the Engagers, and to offer him the hand of Argyle's daughter, the Lady Anne Campbell, in marriage. To this flattering offer Murray added assurances that Montrose should not be sacrificed, but should be given 'honourable employment' in Ireland, and that all Scottish Royalists should be granted pardon and indemnity on laying down their arms.[2]

With this salve to his conscience Charles turned back to the commissioners, and on 27th April-7th May at last accorded them a formal answer to their demands. So far as Scotland alone was concerned, he was ready to grant all without reservation. He would acknowledge the Parliament, ratify its Acts, confirm the establishment of the Presbyterian Kirk, and would himself take the Covenant, if it should still be required of him, after he had landed on Scottish shores. Also he promised to give his assent to Acts of Parliament establishing the Presbyterian 'Church government, Directory of Worship, Confession of Faith, and Catechism' in his other dominions —by which he meant possible, future Acts of possible, future Parliaments, and the Scots understood certain Acts already passed by the Long Parliament, but never ratified by the King.[3] The treaty with the Irish Charles

[1] *Charles II. and Scotland*, pp. 66, 77. *Carte MSS.*, cxx. fol. 113.
[2] See S. R. Gardiner, *Edinburgh Review*, January 1894.
[3] *Ordinances of Parliament*, 1646, 1647, 1648.

absolutely refused to break; he would not disavow Ormonde's actions or recall his commissions. And in return for his concessions he demanded a union of all parties in his favour, the restoration of the Engagers 'to all their public trusts,' the abrogation of all censures, civil or ecclesiastical, beneath which they laboured, and a promise of assistance in the recovery of his other kingdoms. Also he required an assurance, on the public faith, of his own safety, honour, and freedom, and of full restoration to all regal power and authority.

The commissioners, in reply, undertook that the Engagers should be restored to the possession of their estates, but not to the exercise of any 'public trusts' or to their votes in Parliament. The demand for a union of parties was passed over in silence, but they promised that the Scottish Parliament would show itself 'tender of the King's honour,' would make 'all lawful endeavours according to the Covenant' in his behalf, and would countenance those of his friends 'against whom there was no just exception.' They added that the points in dispute were 'more fit to be spoken of when his Majesty shall be present in Parliament, where great respect will be had to his Majesty's desire.'[1]

But without the annulling of the Irish treaty they could by no means be contented, and for the moment Charles's better feelings prevailed. He vowed that, rather than so betray his friends, he would throw up the treaty, and for three days it was suspended.[2] But evil counsellors were not wanting. The constant assurances of Lothian that the King's mere presence in Scotland would gain him all that the commissioners were not empowered to grant, won many who could not 'digest' the Scottish terms to rely on the hope that the execution of them would never be demanded. Others, like Buckingham, Wilmot, and Wentworth, were ready to go all

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. Ap. lv.-lviii. *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fols. 102, 164.

[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 395.

lengths, protesting that it could not dishonour the King to concede something 'so that he may be in a capacity to recover all in the end.' The Queen of Sweden, the Duke of Lorraine—a prince notorious for his faithlessness—even William of Orange, all urged Charles to make any promises asked of him, and to keep as much —or as little—of them afterwards as he had a mind to do.[1]

From this cynical counsel the best of the Cavaliers revolted in horror. 'It is an excellent expedient to draw God's blessing upon us, to have no other excuse for taking an oath than that we resolve not to keep it,' wrote Hyde sarcastically to his friend, Lady Morton. 'Oh my lady, we are making haste out of Christianity and forgetting that there is another Court to appear in when we are out of this.'[2] And to Nicholas he protested with equal vehemence: 'It is such folly and atheism that we should be ashamed to avow or think of it. If there be a judgment from Heaven upon him (*i.e.* on the King) I can only pray it may fall as light on him as may be.'[3]

But Hyde was far away in Spain, and Charles yielded to the tempters. Beguiled by the insinuations of Lothian, trusting in the promises of Argyle, and resolving, at the worst, to follow the advice of his brother-in-law and repudiate all so soon as he had the power, Charles conceded the last demands of the Scots. But he shrank, even now, from publicly disowning the Irish treaty, and would not suffer any clause concerning it to be inserted among the formal articles of agreement.[4] Instead, he gave into the keeping of Cassilis a private note in which he promised to declare 'all treating and agreements made with the Irish rebels null and voyde,' to recall all commissions granted to persons 'not adhering to the Covenant,' and to enforce the penal laws

[1] *Charles II. and Scotland*, pp. 70, 79. *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 122.
[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 528-9.
[3] *Ibid.* iii. p. 14.
[4] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 395.

against 'Papists,' *if these things should be required of him by a free Parliament in Scotland.*[1] On the following day he received the formal invitation to Scotland.

Bitter was the outcry of Charles's best friends. His promise to take the Covenant was known, his compliance about Ireland suspected, and two days after the signature of the articles, Hopton's chaplain wrote to the secretary of Hyde: 'There is now so much of the mystery revealed as makes every honest subject's heart ache, except some poor, still deluded, people. . . . Our religion is gone, and within a few days is expected the funeral of our Liturgy, which is dead already. . . . Yet to call the greatest abettor of this whole business a Presbyterian breeds a mortal quarrel, so much ashamed are they of themselves. What becomes of us I know not, but we wash our hands of all iniquity, as in reference to *treachery* and *treaty*. God be thanked for it, I will travel to the end of the world rather to my damnation in Scotland. The rebels in England laugh at the whole business, and may well, being assured that they shall by it get many more of the King's friends to be Engagers[2] than ever the Scots can get to be Covenanters.'[3]

This last surmise was only too correct. Charles's dishonesty and faithlessness had indeed 'lost him the hearts of many honest men who were before passionately affected to his interest and person.'[4] Many of the exiles now left him and went to compound with the English Government for the recovery of their property; and the zeal of the Royalists in England, who had been ready to rise for the King a month before, was considerably cooled. To fight for their Church and King was one thing, but to fight for the Covenant and the Scots was quite another. 'It's believed very few, or none of his

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. App. lviii., note. *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fols. 170, 192.

[2] *i.e.* to take the oath to be faithful to the Commonwealth. This has no connection with Hamilton's Engagement, 1648.

[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 196. Watson to Edgeman.

[4] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 187, 5th July 1650. Nicholas to Sir R. Browne.

Majesty's friends in England will assist the Presbyterians or Scots,' wrote Nicholas to Hatton.[1] And a couple of months later Hatton responded: 'I was told by one newly come over that this action of his Majesty's taking the Covenant hath had strange effects upon all his party in England, and the sweet Princess Elizabeth hath wept daily ever since.'[2]

Within a few weeks of the date of Hatton's letter the poor little Princess had wept her life away. The greater part of that short life she had passed as the prisoner of the English Parliament, but her father's teaching, and especially his dying words, had sunk deep into her mind. No doubt her elder brother's desertion of his friends and principles added a last pang to the young heart that had known little else than sorrow.

But Charles's hapless sister was not the only person who wept for his dishonour. With bitter tears the Queen, his mother, recounted to her ladies 'the horrid particulars' of his agreement with the Scots. The King, she said, had 'renounced and deserted his own religion, and justly exasperated and incensed all Popish Princes.' When told that she was regarded as the author of the mischief she cried out in horror: 'God forbid that I should have had a hand in persuading him to sacrifice his honour and conscience.'[3] And, in a passionate letter to her son, she repudiated all responsibility for the transaction. 'Je suis obligé devant Dieu et envers vous de vous faire connaître que ce n'a pas été de mon advis, ce qui a été fait.'

She reminded him how she had exhorted him at Beauvais never to take the Covenant, abandon Ireland, or forsake his friends, and how frequently he himself had protested that he would sooner perish than do so. She upbraided him for accepting conditions which his own heart condemned, and which his father had held *en*

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 186, 17th-27th June 1650.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 190, 3rd-13th August 1650.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 174, 11th-21st May 1650.

si grande horreur!' and she expressed the gravest forebodings for the future. If the Scots thought to restore the King alone, they deceived themselves—or him. 'Je voudrais me tromper moi-même, mais je crains beaucoup,' she concluded, softening at the close, 'mes prières ne manqueront jamais, et rien ne me peut ôté la tendresse qui est dans mon cœur pour vous.'[1]

Charles was meanwhile endeavouring to excuse his conduct to his two champions, Ormonde and Montrose, and to save them, if possible, from the consequences of it. He believed that he had already provided for Ormonde's safety by an order—sent three weeks before—directing him to lay down arms and quit Ireland whenever his position became untenable.[2] He now sent messages of regret and apology joined with renewed assurances that he would never do anything *really* 'prejudicial' to the Irish peace. Indeed he still hoped that it would not be required of him, and, in any case, he refused to regard as binding any promises made relative to English or Irish affairs, because, he argued, 'It is not in my power justly to take any resolution therein without the advice of my respective Parliaments of those kingdoms.'[3] This sophistry availed Ormonde little. The mere rumour of the King's treaty with the Scots sufficed to destroy the credit of his deputy with the Irish confederates; and none of Charles's messages reached Ireland until many months later, when the royal cause was already lost.[4]

But the danger of Montrose was greater even than that of Ormonde, and to him Charles hastened to despatch two letters, warning him of the change in the situation. The public letter informed the Scottish marquis that, 'It hath pleased Almighty God to

[1] *Carte MSS.*, cxxx. p. 177, 26th May 1650.

[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 379, 12th April 1650.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 395. *Charles II. and Scotland*, p. 57. King to Prince of Orange, 11th-21st April 1650.

[4] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 391-6.

JAMES GRAHAM, MARQUIS OF MONTROSE.

From the engraving by H. Robinson, after a portrait by Vandyke.

give such a blessing to this treaty at Breda that thereby a right understanding and a full agreement is settled between us and our ancient kingdom of Scotland,' and bade him therefore 'to forbeare all future acts of hostility, . . . and also, immediately upon the receipt of these our letters, to lay down arms, to disband, and withdraw yourself out of the same.'

The private letter referred him to the bearer, Sir William Fleming, for the reasons of this order, begged his trust and forgiveness, promised to restore him speedily to a place of honour and command, and placed 10,000 rix dollars at his disposal for present needs.

Fleming, for his part, was charged to explain to Montrose that dire necessity and the failure of all other hopes had driven the King into the arms of Argyle, to assure him of the King's continued affection and esteem, and to appeal to his 'magnanimity' to bear all with patience. Also Fleming was instructed to consult with Argyle's agent, Will Murray, for the best means of providing suitable employment for Montrose, and he carried a letter from the King to the Committee of Estates, dated the 8th-18th of May, earnestly desiring that 'suitable and fit conditions' might be offered to all the Scottish Loyalists now ordered to disband.

Fleming had received his first instructions on May 3rd-13th, but five days later he was still in Breda, and in the meantime Charles's mind misgave him that the Covenanters would play him false if the fear of Montrose were taken from them. Accordingly on the 9th-19th of May he recalled Fleming to his presence and provided him with a new and contradictory set of instructions. Montrose was to do as seemed best to himself. If he misdoubted the intentions of Argyle, he must keep his forces together and call all Royalists to hasten to him, or he might treat with Will Murray for Argyle's consent to keep the army for the King's service.[1]

[1] *Wigton Papers*, ii. pp. 472-9. *Maitland Club Miscellany*: Fleming's Mission to Montrose.

It mattered very little what directions Charles sent now, for none of them were destined to reach him for whom they were intended. On May 10th-20th, Fleming left Breda, and on the day that he landed at Leith, 18th-28th May, Montrose was led captive through the streets of Edinburgh.

All too late were Charles's efforts to save the faithful servant whom—unintentionally, it is true, but none the less surely—he had delivered into the hands of implacable foes. A trifle would have turned the scale in favour of Montrose, and, had he been the only hope of Royalism in Scotland, many would have flocked to his standard. The Gordons, Mackenzies, Macleods, Mackays, even many of the Lowland gentry, would have risen at his bidding, and Sir Thomas Middleton had boasted that he could bring over all the cavalry of the Parliament to the King. But the treaty of Breda had extinguished Royalism in Scotland even more completely than in England and Ireland. It was far safer to join with the King and Argyle than to rise for the King with Montrose, and, from the first rumour of the treaty, all chance of raising a Royalist army in the Highlands was at an end. The Earl of Seaforth, chief of the Mackenzies, on whose support Montrose had counted much, lingered on the Continent, awaiting the issue of events, and turning a deaf ear to his friend's pathetic appeal: 'Your presence, *where you know*, would do much good.'[1] And others followed Seaforth's example, professing loyalty with their lips, but refusing to risk life and property in the cause of a King whom they might yet serve with perfect security. By his own act Charles ruined Montrose, and his only excuse lies in the fact that, when he first opened negotiations with Argyle, he really believed the Royalist Marquis to have so large a foreign army as to be independent of Scottish support.

This was a grave error. The promises of the continental princes had remained unfulfilled, want of money

[1] *Napier*, ii. p. 716. Montrose to Seaforth, 15th August 1649.

hampered the levies of Montrose, and nearly a thousand of his men were lost in a shipwreck off the coast of Norway. It was but a small force that he had gathered at his rendezvous in the Orkneys during the winter of 1649-1650, and when he landed at Kirkwall in the middle of March he relied chiefly on a native rising.[1] 1650 March-April

Then it was that he received Charles's letter dated from Jersey, 12th-22nd January, and heard, for the first time, of his intention to treat with the Covenanters. The news came as a final blow to a man already depressed by disappointment, and saddened by the recent and untimely deaths of his two best friends and supporters, the Earls of Morton and Kinnoul.[2] He saw at once that the ground was cut from under his feet, but Charles had bidden him pursue his enterprise, and he never once thought of turning back. The King had asked his life and it was given freely, without a word of reproach or hint of resentment. In his last letter to Charles, of the 26th March-5th April, he warned him gently against the wiles of Argyle, assured him of his own unchangeable devotion, and thanked him gratefully for his gift of the garter, 'for which,' he said, 'I can make your Majesty no other humble acknowledgement, bot, with the more alacrity and bensell, *abandon still my life to search my death*, for the interests of your Majesty's honour and service.'[3]

It was, alas, no mere figure of speech, for it was literally to death he went, when, in the middle of April he landed his little army on the coast of Caithness. For cavalry he had only a small band of his own personal friends, and his whole force numbered no more than two thousand men, some of whom he was obliged to leave to garrison the country behind him.[4]

He made his way southwards through Sutherland, to the river Oikel, on the borders of Ross, but, as he had

[1] Napier's *Montrose*, ii. p. 741. [2] *Ibid.* p. 727.
[3] *Charles II. and Scotland*, p. 42. *Calendar of Dom. State Papers*, 26th March-5th April 1650. [4] *Ibid.* p. 42. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. fol. 18.

1650 May

foreseen, the Mackenzies would not rise in the absence of their chief, and he was forced back to the east coast. This was fatal, because there the enemy's horse were able to act, and on April 27th-May 7th, at Corbiesdale, the Loyalists were overwhelmed, routed, and completely cut to pieces by a large force of cavalry under Colonel Strachan. Some of the officers were taken prisoners, most died where they stood, and Montrose and Kinnoul —brother to that Kinnoul who had died in the Orkneys— escaped and made their way westwards up the Oikel. Kinnoul perished in the mountains, of cold and hunger and Montrose, 'sorely wounded' and faint with famine, trusted himself to Macleod of Assynt, who betrayed him, for a reward, to his enemies.

It is unlikely that Argyle would have kept his promise to secure the safety of Montrose in any event, but the fact that his rival had been taken in arms against the Parliament acquitted him of the obligation, and left him free to indulge his hatred with every hideous circumstance that a mean and ignoble nature could devise.

Montrose had been captured on May 4th-14th, and three days later, 7th-17th May, he was delivered into the charge of General David Leslie, who was instructed to heap insult and indignity upon him, and to exhibit him everywhere, in triumph, to the mob. The painful progress southwards occupied ten days, and Montrose, though very ill, and 'in a high fever,' bore it all with calm, unruffled dignity. He heard the ministers who reviled and abused him with patient endurance; he welcomed the sympathisers who came to meet him with cheerful pleasure; he bade a last farewell to his children at Kinnaird with Christian courage and resignation, and he faced the crowds who came to gaze upon him with a grave, unmoved countenance, which so impressed them that, far from exulting over his downfall, they grieved for him, and brought him gifts of clothes and other necessaries.[1]

[1] *Napier*, ii. p. 773. Account of the Rev. James Fraser.

The gates of Edinburgh were reached at last, at four o'clock in the afternoon of the 18th-28th May, and there Leslie delivered his prisoner up to the city magistrates. Montrose was then placed in a cart, to which he was tightly bound with cords, and driven by the hangman through the streets of Edinburgh, the other prisoners, bound two and two, going before him. Widows of the men slain in his wars had been hired to incite the mob to violence, and because it was hoped that stones would be thrown, the Marquis's hands were tied, 'that he might not be able, by his hands, to save his face.'

But the mob of Edinburgh, less brutal than its rulers, was touched with awe and pity, as the other mobs had been, and gave him tears and prayers, instead of oaths and curses.

'In all the way there appeared in him such majesty, courage, modesty, and even something more than natural,' says an eye-witness of the scene, 'that those common women, who had lost their husbands and children in his wars and had been hired to stone him, were, upon the sight of him, so astonished and moved that their intended curse turned into tears and prayers; so that next day all the ministers preached against them for not stoning and reviling him.' 'The vast crowd . . . could not now restrain tears,' says another, himself a minister of the Covenant. 'Wringing their hands, they began to be shaken with the first show of his tragedy.'[1]

And the French resident in Edinburgh also testified to the general lamentation, which showed, he said, 'how much their hearts were touched by the nobility of his bearing amid such a complication of miseries.'[2]

Argyle had given orders for the cart to be stopped below the balcony in which he sat, with his son and daughter-in-law, the Chancellor Loudon, and Johnston of Warriston, that they might gloat over their victim at their leisure. But when Montrose turned his face towards them and raised his eyes to theirs, they quailed before

[1] Napier's *Montrose*, ii. pp. 777-9. [2] *Ibid.* p. 781.

him. Silent and ashamed, they crept away to hide themselves behind the window blinds, and an English voice cried out from the crowd in scorn that 'it was no wonder they started aside at his look, for they durst not look him in the face these seven years bygone.'[1]

When at last the prisoner reached the Tolbooth about seven o'clock in the evening, it could not but be felt that the triumph had rested with him rather than with his captors.

During the remaining three days of his martyrdom, the majestic calm of Montrose never failed, though neither rest nor peace were allowed him. By night he was harassed with the presence of Major Weir, captain of the Town Guard, who would not suffer him to pray or to sleep, but reviled him without ceasing, smoking all the while, 'though the Marquis had an aversion to the smell of tobacco above anything in the world.'[2] All day the covenanting ministers hovered around their victim, adjuring him to confess his sins and be reconciled to the Kirk, without which, they assured him, he would go to eternal damnation. He heard them with patience, and answered them, as they admitted, 'handsomely,' illustrating his arguments with Latin and scriptural quotations. He confessed himself a sinner, as all men were, and to their particular charge of pride and vanity he pleaded guilty; 'he confessed he was one of those who loved praise for virtuous actions.' But this failed to satisfy them; the sentence of excommunication could not be relaxed unless he acknowledged that his loyalty had been a crime, and this he resolutely refused to do.

'I am very sorry that any actions of mine have been offensive to the Church of Scotland, and I would, with all my heart, be reconciled with the same,' he said. 'But since I cannot obtain it on any other terms—unless I call that my sin, which I account to have been my duty

[1] Napier's *Montrose*, ii. p. 779.
[2] *Ibid.* ii. p. 794, note. *Wigton Papers.*

—I cannot, for all the reason and conscience in the world.'[1]

On Monday, May 20th-30th, at ten o'clock, he was summoned before the Parliament, not for trial—that had been dispensed with—but to receive his sentence. He looked pale and worn, and permission to shave had been denied him, but his dress was arranged with the greatest care. He wore a black cloth suit, covered with lace, and over it a coat of scarlet, trimmed with silver. On his beaver hat was a silver band, his stockings, garters, and the rosettes on his shoes were of carnation-coloured silk, and his gloves were white. 'All of which he had caused to be made for him immediately on his coming to Edinburgh, as if he had been going about some festival—rather than tragical—affair.'[2]

Being informed that the Parliament was agreed with the King, he appeared before it bareheaded, and listened to the long and abusive harangue of the Chancellor with respectful patience. At its close he answered all the charges against him in detail, refuting them 'with such a gravity and possessedness as was admirable.'[3]

The first Covenant, he said, he had taken and kept. The second Covenant, he thanked God, he had never taken, and therefore could not break. His campaigns in the Highlands had always been undertaken at the royal command, which he held himself bound to obey, and the accusation of cruelty he emphatically denied. 'I dare avow, in the presence of God, that never a hair of Scotsman's head that I could save fell to the ground.' Finally, he appealed from his present judges 'to the righteous Judge of all the world, who one day must be your Judge and mine.'[4]

Then he knelt to hear his sentence, which condemned

[1] *Napier*, ii. pp. 785-8. Wodrow's 'Testimony of the Rev. Patrick Simson.'
[2] *Ibid.* ii. p. 792. Diary of Balfour.
[3] *Ibid.* ii. p. 796. *Wigton MSS.*
[4] *Ibid.* ii. p. 794. *Wigton MSS.*

1650 May 21st-31st

him to be hung the next morning at Edinburgh Cross, after which he was to be quartered, his head to be placed on the Tolbooth, and his limbs to be distributed in other towns. At the end 'he lifted up his face, without any word speaking,' and was led back to his prison, having, as a member of the Parliament testified, 'behaved himself all the time in the House with a great deal of courage and modesty, unmoved and undaunted.'

Once again he was attacked by the ministers, but he told them firmly that he regarded his sentence as the greatest of honours. 'I am beholden to you, that, lest my loyalty should be forgotten, ye have appointed five of the most eminent towns to bear witness of it to posterity.' And to their continued importunities he answered shortly: 'I pray you, gentlemen, let me die in peace.'[1]

Many, moved by the gallant bearing and Christian patience of the captive, would fain have had his sentence mitigated, and the Provost of Edinburgh entered a protest against the proceedings, which were, he said, 'unmanly.' But Argyle was inexorable, and on the morning of Tuesday, May 21st-31st, the sentence was carried out in every detail.[2]

Montrose walked to execution arrayed in the same festive garments that he had worn on the previous day, and, as, before, he won the admiration of all spectators.[3] 'He stept along the streets with so great state, and there appeared in his countenance so much beauty, majesty, and gravity as amazed the beholders. And many of his enemies did acknowledge him to be the bravest subject in the world, and in him a gallantry that graced all the crowd,' records the Covenanter, James Fraser.

When he saw the number of troops turned out to guard the town, the Marquis smiled. 'What! am I still a terror to them?' he said. 'My ghost will haunt them.'

He had received a private warning from Argyle 'to be sparing in speaking to the King's disadvantage,' and, in

[1] *Napier*, ii. p. 790. Diary of Rev. Robert Traill. [2] *Ibid.* p. 797.
[3] *Diary of John Nicoll*, pp. 12, 13. Bannatyne Club.

his last speech on the scaffold, he strove to acquit his Sovereign of any responsibility for his misfortunes. 'It has been spoken of me that I would blame the King,' he said. 'God forbid! For the late King, he lived a saint and died a martyr. I pray God I may end as he did. If ever I would wish my soul in another man's stead, it should be in his. For this King, never were people happier of a king. His commands to me were most just, in nothing that he promises will he fail; he deals justly with all men. I pray God he be so dealt withal that he be not betrayed under trust as his father was.' Speaking of himself, he regretted the implacability of the Kirk, but steadily justified his actions in the King's service, appealed from the injustice of man to the justice and mercy of God, and declared his forgiveness of his enemies. 'I blame no man, I complain of no man. They are instruments. God forgive them.' Finally, he concluded: 'I have no more to say but that I desire your charity and your prayers, and I shall pray for you all. I leave my soul to God, my service to my Prince, my goodwill to my friends, my love and charity to you all.'

None of his friends had been suffered to come near him, but two ministers had been appointed to attend him, and to them he next turned, asking them to pray with him. This they refused to do, and after standing a moment in silent prayer, he called the executioner to him, received the papers — his own declarations, and Wishart's history of his wars, which the Parliament had ordered to be fastened round his neck—and mounted the ladder 'with an undaunted courage and gravity.' The hangman wept unrestrainedly as he performed his office, and the crowd was not less moved. Deep and lasting was the impression made by the life and death of 'the great Marquis,' and vainly did Argyle try to belittle it. Friend and foe, Royalist, Covenanter, Presbyterian minister, Frenchman, and Englishman, alike bear witness to the courage, dignity, Christian resignation and charity

1650 May 25th-June 4th

with which Montrose met his fate. 'It is absolutely believed that he hath overcome more men by his death, in Scotland, than he would have done if he had lived,' wrote an English Parliamentarian: 'for I never saw a sweeter carriage in a man in all my life.'[1]

The execution had been hurried, and a trial dispensed with, lest the matter should come to the ears of the King, and affairs be complicated by his protest. The manœuvre was successful. Montrose had been dead a week ere the news of his capture reached the Continent, and the only protest raised—that of the King and Queen-Regent of France, instigated by the Coadjutor-Archbishop of Paris[2]—came many days too late.[3]

On May 25th-June 4th, four days after the completion of the tragedy, the Scottish Parliament deigned to become aware of the arrival of messengers from the King. Fleming had already been a week in Scotland, but he was only now suffered to present the letters with which he was charged to the House. Close upon his heels followed Will Murray, whom Charles had despatched as soon as news of the battle of Corbiesdale had reached him, with a letter dated 12th-22nd May, demanding a full explanation of the affair, and stating that the King was 'very sorrowful and grieved' to hear that there had been blood shed among his good subjects of Scotland.[4] The manner in which this letter was interpreted to the House may be best judged by comparing it with an entry in the diary of Sir James Balfour, who was present on the occasion.

'Saturday, May 25, 1650.—A letter from the King's Majesty to the Parliament, dated from Breda, 12th May 1650, showing that he was heartily sorry that James Graham had invaded this kingdom, and how he had

[1] *Napier*, ii. pp. 801-9. Diary of John Nicholl; Account of James Fraser; Letter from Edinburgh, 21st May 1650.

[2] Paul de Gondi, *Cardinal de Retz.*

[3] *Napier*, ii. p. 770.

[4] *Charles II. and Scotland*, p. 103.

discharged him from doing the same; and earnestly desires the Estates of Parliament to do him that justice as not to believe that he was accessory to the said invasion in the least degree.' Not content with this, and with the copy of the order to Montrose to lay down arms which was produced by Fleming, Argyle further informed the House that the King had assured him, through Lothian, that he was 'no ways sorry that James Graham was defeat, in respect, as he said, he had made that invasion without and contrary to his command.'[1]

Now, seeing that Charles's earlier letter to Montrose had been printed in three languages, and had been widely read in Scotland and elsewhere, it is extremely unlikely that he made any such assertion. Doubtless he explained to Lothian that he had countermanded the expedition—too late—and Lothian and Argyle between them coloured his words as best suited their own purposes. That, after hearing of the 'horrid murder' of his faithful subject, he dissembled his resentment and continued to treat with the murderers is shame enough; it is unnecessary to accuse him of a greater baseness.

But while these events were happening in Scotland, the King remained at Breda, ignorant of all, and struggling fitfully in the meshes wherein he had entangled himself. It seemed as though he sought to defy the Scots in every possible way; often, the ministers complained, 'he was balling and dancing till near day.' And his piety offended no less than his levity. The day on which his letters were read in Parliament found him engaged in a hot dispute with the commissioners of the Kirk. They had learnt that on the next day, Sunday, he intended to receive the Holy Communion, kneeling, and according to the rites of the English Church, and they hastened to remonstrate, pointing out to him 'the sin of so doing, and the provocation against God to procure a blasting of all his designs.' But Charles was no longer pliant, and when they returned to the attack after supper they found

[1] *Balfour*, iv. pp. 24, 25.

1650 May 29th-June 8th

him 'tenaciously resolute to continue his purpose.' He told them firmly that such had always been his father's custom, 'and that it behooved him to doe soe likewise, . . . and that he did it to procure ane blessing from God upon his intended voyage.' And he fulfilled his purpose next day, the Bishop of Derry, a particular enemy of the Kirk, officiating.[1] The hearts of the ministers misgave them that their King would make but a poor champion of the Covenant. But their misgivings came too late; on the following Wednesday, May 29th-June 8th, the King left Breda with Lothian and Cassilis for Hounslerdyke, where he intended to spend a couple of days with the Prince of Orange before embarking for Scotland, and there he first heard of the death of Montrose. Charles was 'amazed,' and wrote at once to the young son, and successor, of the Marquis, giving him the title that the Parliament had declared forfeited.

'My Lord of Montrose,—Though your father is unfortunately lost, contrary to my expectation, yet, I assure you, I shall have the same care for you as if he were still living *and as able to serve me as ever*; and I shall provide for your subsistence *with that affection you have reason to expect from your affectionate friend*,

'*June* the *8th*, 1650.'[1] 'Charles R.

The letter is singularly inadequate to the occasion, utterly devoid as it is of the remorse, sympathy, and righteous indignation that would have seemed natural in the circumstances, yet it contains a tacit acknowledgment that the boy's father had perished in the King's service, and Charles's very coldness and reserve may have been due to the weight of shame that overwhelmed him. That he was not yet dead to shame is evident in the light of later events, but probably he shrank from facing the extent of his own responsibility for the tragedy, and strove rather to stifle his remorse.

[1] Livingstone's *Life*, pp. 174, 177. Wodrow Society.
[2] *Napier*, ii. p. 766.

1650
June 1st-11th

For the moment his agreement with the Covenanters was imperilled, and he vowed he would not go to Scotland at all. Indeed, not resentment only, but care for his personal safety, made him hesitate to trust himself there. It was certainly rash to rely on 'the pure good-nature of Argyle,' as Hyde scornfully suggested, though, he added, that personage certainly 'had reason enough to believe that the executing the Marquis of Montrose would be as decent a ceremony to precede the coronation as ye execution of the Marquis of Huntly was to succeed the proclamation of his Majesty. Whether this method be Presbyterian or Independent, those that have a foolish desire to escape hanging have no reason to be in love with it.'[1]

But in a couple of days Charles's doubts and indignation had been soothed and overcome by the persuasions of Lothian, or the calm counsels of his brother-in-law, and he consented to embark in a Dutch man-of-war.

In the meantime, the very thing that he had apprehended had come to pass: the Scottish Parliament, having no longer anything to fear from Scottish Royalists, declared itself dissatisfied with the agreement of Breda, and directed the commissioners to stand out for higher terms. The concessions concerning the Engagers were summarily withdrawn, neither they nor any other 'excepted' persons were to set foot in Scotland. The King was to openly break the treaty with the Irish, to sternly prohibit the practice of the Roman Catholic religion throughout his dominions, to take the Covenant, to force it on all his subjects, and to banish from his presence all persons not 'adhering' to it. Further, he was to understand that the Scots would not restore him by force in England unless Kirk and Parliament decided that course to be 'lawful and necessary,' that the promise to consider his wishes bound the Scottish Parliament to nothing, and that all the promises and assurances

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xl. fol. 106.

already given him remained conditional on his 'performing satisfaction to the desires of the Kirk and Kingdom.'[1]

These new instructions were received by Cassilis and Lothian at Hounslerdyke on June 1st-11th, but Lothian was not the man to have his schemes frustrated at the last minute, and he refused to communicate the Parliament's change of attitude to the King. 'It would,' he said, 'provoke the King to take some other course, and not to go to Scotland at all.' He could not, however, prevent Cassilis from sending the letters on to the other commissioners, who were already embarked, and they immediately hastened ashore, resolved to prevent the King from sailing until they had obtained 'satisfaction' for the Parliament. Unfortunately for them the wind did not suffer them to land at Terheiden, and they were obliged to put in at Schevenengen, where they arrived at midnight. Thence Winram and Smith proceeded on foot to Hounslerdyke, and at daybreak Brodie, Jaffray, and the three ministers arrived there on horseback, only to learn that the King, their colleagues, and a large number of 'malignants,' including Hamilton, Lauderdale, Wentworth, Wilmot, Cleveland, and Dr. Goffe (Charles's chaplain) had gone on board ship at Terheiden. After some hesitation Brodie and Jaffray decided to follow them. The ministers demurred longer. 'I thought,' says Livingstone, 'in regard of the prophane, malignant company, and in regard how matters stood in the treaty, we were taking along the plague of God to Scotland.' But finally, on Wood's suggestion that 'it was a pity the King and my Lord Cassilis should be there and none to preach to them,' it was decided to join the rest.[2] Thus the King set sail, still in ignorance of the new and more stringent conditions to be wrung from him. The weather was bad, contrary winds delayed their progress, and on June 11th-21st they were com-

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. lxi.
[2] Livingstone's *Life*, pp. 178-81.

pelled to cast anchor off Heligoland, at the mouth of the Elbe. This seemed to the commissioners a fitting opportunity to obtain the last concessions, and Charles was at last informed of the new demands of the Parliament.[1] Again he rebelled, rejected them absolutely, and declared that rather than grant them he would land in Denmark, 'and lay aside all thoughts of coming into Scotland upon such terms.' This dispute continued until they came in sight of Scotland on Friday, June 21st-July 1st, and then, just as despair had seized the commissioners, Charles yielded, and agreed to take the Covenant and sign the articles required of him. The following Sunday was appointed for the fulfilment of his promise, and on that day, July 3rd, anchored at the mouth of the Spey, Charles made his final sacrifice of honour and conscience.

1650 June 23rd-July 3rd

One last struggle he made ere he succumbed. He attempted to declare, when he took the oath, 'that what he did should not import any infringement of the laws of England,' and pointed out that the ordinances by which the Long Parliament had established Presbyterianism in England were not laws, because they had never received the King's assent. But the commissioners one and all refused to accept his oath if he added to it a word more than the form prescribed. 'He pressed much and long that he behooved to do it,' until at last Livingstone suggested that the matter should be delayed, 'seeing that both he and we were in some heat and distempers by that dispute.'[2] But the others would brook no further delay, and Charles, yielding with a bad grace, signed the documents presented to him, and took the oath in the following terms:—

'I, Charles, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, do assure and declare, by my solemn oath, in the presence of Almighty God, the searcher of all hearts, my allowance

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. lxiii.-lxv.
[2] *Livingstone*, pp. 182-3.

and approbation of the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant above written, and faithfully oblige myself to prosecute the ends thereof in my station and calling. And I shall, for myself and my successors, consent and agree to all Acts of Parliament enjoining the National Covenant, the Solemn League and Covenant, and fully establishing Presbyterial government, the Directory of Worship, Confession of Faith, and Catechisms in the kingdom of Scotland, as they are approven by the General Assembly of that Kirk and Parliament of that kingdom. And I shall give my royal assent to Acts of Parliament enjoining the same in the rest of my dominions. And I shall observe these in my own practice and family, and shall never make opposition to any of these, nor endeavour any alteration therein.' [1]

To make assurance doubly sure the commissioners inserted, after the words 'I shall give my royal assent to Acts of Parliament,' the additional words, 'bills or ordinances, passed or to be passed, in the Houses of Parliament,' which they forced Charles to initial, thus leaving him no way of escape, and tearing from him the last remnant of his self-respect.[2]

The long and pitiful struggle was over, and the King had sold his soul for a mess of pottage; nor were the consciences of his tempters wholly clear in the matter, and both Jaffray and Livingstone have left on record their remorse. 'We did both sinfully entangle and engage the nation, ourselves, and that poor, young Prince to whom we were sent, making him sign and swear a Covenant which we knew from clear and demonstrable reasons that he hated in his heart,' confessed Jaffray in his diary; 'yet, finding that upon these terms only he could be admitted to rule over us, all other means having then failed him, he sinfully complied with what we, most sinfully, pressed upon him. . . . In this he

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. App. lxiv.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xl. fol. 80.

was not so constant to his principles as his father, but his strait and our guiltiness was the greater.'[1]

And says Livingstone: 'It seems to have been the guilt not of the commissioners only but of the whole State—yea, of the Church.'[2]

[1] *Diary of Jaffray*, p. 32. *Diary of Brodie*, preface.
[2] *Livingstone*, p. 183.

CHAPTER VIII

Charles's Arrival in Scotland—Dismissal of his Friends—Argyle's Policy—The King's Position—Alarm in England—Cromwell marches to Scotland—Plans of the English Royalists—Their Failure—Scottish Preparations—Anne Murray—The King and the Army—Purging—The New Declaration—Charles and the Dean of Tuam—The Battle of Dunbar.

1650 July

THE King being, as the English papers contemptuously phrased it, safely 'catcht in the springe of the Kirk,'[1] was at last deemed worthy to set foot on Scottish soil. On Monday, 24th June-4th July, he landed at Garmouth, on the Spey, escaping, as though by a miracle, four ships of the English Parliament, which left the bay as he entered it. To the watchers on the shore it appeared that the King was in imminent peril; but a Scottish mist descending between the two little fleets hid each from the other, and Charles came safely to land. It was remembered that 'a like Providence' had saved his great-grandmother, Queen Mary, from the designs of Elizabeth on her voyage from France to Scotland, but the omen was not a happy one.

'I pray God he prove more fortunate!' was the comment of the Loyalists.

The people received their Sovereign with every demonstration of joy; but it was observed that 'none of the better sort were permitted access by the commissioners but such as were of Argyle his faction,' and the King was hurried away to a house in the Bog of Gicht, once the property of the Marquis of Huntly, but now in the possession of Argyle.[2]

[1] *Mercurius Politicus*, June 6th-16th, 1650.

[2] *Dom. State Papers*, Record Office, Interreg., ix. fol. 126, 1st-11th August 1650.

So far he was accompanied by all the friends and followers, Scottish Engagers and English Cavaliers, who had sailed with him from Holland; but on their arrival at the Bog of Gicht the Engagers, Hamilton, Lauderdale, Brentford, Dunfermline, and St. Clair, received peremptory orders to quit the royal presence. They obeyed, but lingered in the neighbourhood, and on Wednesday, July the 6th, Arthur Erskine, brother of the Earl of Mar, came from the Committee of Estates and forced the King to move that same night to Strathbogie. On the next day they journeyed to Aberdeen, and, as they crossed the river Ury, Charles looked around him sadly, remarking, with a sigh, that the scenery reminded him of his 'dear England.'[1] All his heart was with the rival kingdom, and Scotland was no more to him than a means of returning thither; but the Scots were, as yet, ignorant of this, and the citizens of Aberdeen received him gladly. Bonfires were lighted in the streets, which swarmed with loyal and excited subjects, and the magistrates of the town presented their Sovereign with fifteen hundred pounds Scots, a generosity which other cities were warned by the Parliament not to imitate. But in strange contrast to all this loyal demonstration was the sight that greeted Charles's eyes from the windows of the house where he was lodged, for thence he could plainly see the hand of Montrose elevated on the town port.[2] Doubtless the house had been chosen by his guides for that very reason, but it is not recorded that he expressed any resentment of the insult. 'The young man hath one quality of a king: he hath learnt already to forget!' mocked the English papers.

On Friday, July 8th, Charles slept at Dunnottar Castle, but his host, the Earl Marshal, had been of Hamilton's Engagement, and was therefore forbidden to approach the royal guest after he had received him at the gates. The next two days, Saturday and Sunday, were passed

[1] Lyon, *Personal History of Charles II.*, p. 34.
[2] Walker's *Historical Discourses*, p. 160.

at Kinnaird, the seat of the time-serving Earl of Southesk, the father-in-law of Montrose. To his care the Parliament had intrusted the young sons of the dead Marquis, but it is unlikely that the King was allowed to speak to them, and there is no mention of any meeting between them.

At Dundee, where he tarried three days, Charles was 'nobly' entertained by the provost and burgesses. At St. Andrews he was presented with the keys of the city, wrought in silver, and had to endure a long Latin oration, 'running much on the duties of kings,' delivered by the Principal of St. Mary's College. On Saturday, July 16th, he passed through Cupar, where 'dessert' was offered him at the Tolbooth, and the schoolmaster of the town was appointed 'to give him a music song or two while he was at table.'[1] That same evening he arrived at the royal residence of Falkland.

Cassilis and Lothian had been averse from the choice of this house as a domicile for the King because, they alleged, there was 'laid in all that place only stuff for four rooms, and for provisions for the mouth it seems what the Earl of Annandale had for his private use must be trusted to.' The Royalists, however, looked upon the choice as one of good omen.

'On the ninth day,' wrote one of the King's train, 'he came to his own house at Falkland, where he stays, having a little park with deer, and fair hills about it for hunting. It was from thence that King James hunted to the Earl of Gowrie's house at Perth, ten miles distant, where the conspiracy was laid, and God grant his Majesty may be as fortunate.'[2]

For the moment nothing seemed less likely than the fulfilment of this prayer. The hopes for the restoration of the Engagers were already overthrown. Hamilton was banished to the isle of Arran, 'a place for the most part inhabited with wild beasts,' and his petition for

[1] *Lyon*, p. 42. *Napier*, ii.

[2] *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. fols. 104, 126.

pardon was summarily rejected, though Charles averred that 'the meanest of his subjects would not have made so low a petition to him.'[1] Lauderdale was confined to his own house; Brentford went to Edinburgh, where he consoled himself by 'drinking as fast as ever,' pending the decision of his fate. The rest were admitted to penance by the Kirk, but regained neither place nor power. Charles complained bitterly; but Hamilton, at parting, bade him beware how he offended Argyle, and assured him that he would have 'worse to endure yet.' This was shortly proved true, for the Parliament next turned its attention to Charles's English followers, and 'voted away' from him all save nine—namely, the Duke of Buckingham, Lord Wilmot, Dr. Fraser, Harry Seymour, Richard Harding, Thomas Ross, one gentleman usher, and two menial servants. These were allowed to remain on sufferance until Cassilis and Lothian should report on their character and conduct.

This was the news that greeted Charles at Falkland, where the committee sent to receive him presented him with a confirmation of the treaty of Heligoland, and also with a long list of those whom he was required to banish from his train. In the eyes of those staunch Loyalists who had remained on the Continent their facile comrades were justly punished for their 'juggling complying,' but the King was dismayed, and wrote at once to expostulate with the Parliament.[2] He represented that if he conformed to the order it could only be with deep sorrow, 'as knowing well the merit and fidelity of many of the persons to be removed,' and he declared himself 'truly sensible of the hard condition most of them will be subjected to by this resolution.' Also he endeavoured to enlist the sympathies of the Kirk in the person of David Dickson, a minister sent to attend on him, to whom he

[1] *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., xi. fol. 2.

[2] *Walker*, p. 159. *Balfour*, iv. pp. 64, 65, 77. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. fol. 126; xi. p. 5. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. App. lxv. *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 2.

pointed out that the banished English were all 'deserving persons, and such as I can witness to have been very instrumental in the happy agreement between me and this kingdom.'[1]

As a result of this protest the two secretaries, Long and Oudart, were granted leave to remain in Scotland, though not at Court. The rest of the proscribed persons were required to quit the kingdom within eight days, a sum of money was voted, but not paid, to assist their departure, and Wilmot and Harding were added to the list of the banished. The decree was received with stolid defiance; not one of the English left the country, Wilmot and Harding returned to Court, after a brief absence, and Argyle, who had come to Falkland and remained there after the departure of the other commissioners, made no attempt to enforce the orders of the Parliament.[2]

The truth was that, like Charles himself, Argyle was playing a double game. He was a man of consummate ability, 'who wanted nothing but honesty and courage to be a very extraordinary man, having all other good talents in a great degree,' and he knew well 'on how slippery ground himself stood.'[3] He was the champion of the Kirk and Covenant; the Kirk was a great power, and if it maintained its position all would be well. But the nation at large was weary of clerical tyranny, its heart was with the King, and if the King prevailed against the Kirk, Argyle's position would be perilous indeed. He was far too wise to put any trust in the oaths and promises wrung from Charles, and he resolved to provide against all contingencies by winning the King's confidence and marrying him to his daughter, the Lady Anne Campbell. To this end he appointed his son, Lord Lorne, Captain of the Royal Bodyguard, and instructed him to gratify the King in everything possible. Also he took care to have Charles treated with all due cere-

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xl. fols. 103, 113, 11th-21st, 16th-26th July 1650.
[2] *Walker*, p. 161. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., xi. fol. 5.
[3] *Clarendon*, *History*, xii. pp. 118, 142.

mony and respect. 'In a word, the King's table was well served, and there he sat in majesty, waited upon with decency; he had good horses to ride about to take the air, and was then well attended, and in all public appearances seemed to want nothing that was due to a great king.' At the same time he was entirely debarred from any share in the government, was never allowed to sit in council, nor so much as informed of the decisions there taken. He could not 'dispose or order anything, or himself go to any other place than was assigned to him.'[1] He was carefully cut off from all intercourse with the gentry and populace lest he should discover his own power, and he was always surrounded by the creatures of Argyle.

'The King's position,' wrote Sir Edward Walker, 'is most sad and dangerous. . . . He is outwardly served and waited on with all fitting ceremony due to a king, but in his liberty not much above a prisoner, sentinels being set every night about his lodging, few daring to speak freely or privately to him, and spies (being) set upon his words and actions. His bedchamber is not free to himself, the ministers almost daily thrusting in upon him to catechise and instruct him, and, I believe, to exact repetitions from him.'[2]

The zeal of the Kirk for Charles's conversion was indeed untiring. Prayers, sermons, and theological discourses, 'some of a great length,' and all flavoured with bitter invective against his father, his mother, and himself, were his daily entertainment. On one occasion he was condemned to sit through as many as six sermons preached in succession. An irksome watch was kept on all his 'looks and gestures.' He was 'not so much as allowed to walk abroad on Sundays,' and received a sharp reprimand 'if he smiled on those days.' All card-playing and other amusements were severely repressed.[3] There is a story that once, when the King had been seen

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 5. [2] *Walker*, p. 195.
[3] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 4. *Burnet* (Clarendon Press, 1833), i. p. 99.

at cards through an open window, the minister deputed to rebuke him concluded his pious exhortation with a recommendation to 'shut the window next time,' but such levity was certainly uncommon among the brethren of the Covenant, and Charles had to endure much at their hands. In short he was a prisoner, but all irksome restraints and disabilities were skilfully attributed to the fanaticism of the Kirk and of some of the members of Parliament, while Argyle posed as the wise and tolerant statesman who humoured the popular fancies that he might the more firmly grasp the reins of government. Indeed he did not scruple to assure Charles that, if he would but 'please these madmen for the present,' he would be able to shake off their yoke in England. This, being the very idea in Charles's own mind, was a masterpiece of diplomacy.[1]

'Never,' says Clarendon, 'was there a better courtier than Argyle, who made all the possible address to make himself gracious to the King, and entertained him with very pleasant discourses, with such insinuations, that the King did not only very well like his conversation, but often believed that he had a mind to please and gratify him.'

Yet it was not possible for Charles to put any real trust in the man who had sold his father to the English Parliament, and had so recently and barbarously caused Montrose to be put to death. Moreover, he did not fail to observe that whenever he pressed for some personal liberty or further privilege, Argyle immediately 'gathered up his countenance and retired from his address.'[2] Therefore, when the Marquis suggested that the King would best win the national confidence by making a Presbyterian marriage, 'and thought his own daughter would be the properest match for him,' Charles adroitly parried the proposal, which he dared not refuse, with the reply that he must 'in common decency' first consult his

[1] *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. fol. 152.

[2] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 5.

mother.[1] In the duel of wits all depended on which of the two could best deceive the other, and if Argyle was a past-master in the art of dissembling, Charles was an apt pupil. 'If the King can carry it so as to make Argyle confident of him, and if Argyle may believe that he shall hold his power, the business may yet do well,'[2] wrote Sir George Radcliffe. 1650 June-July

In the meantime, despite the jests of the newspapers and the Government's reiterated professions of confidence in itself and contempt for the Scots, a feeling of great uneasiness prevailed throughout England. Very early in the year the Government had betrayed its nervousness by forcing the oath to be faithful to the Commonwealth on the whole male population—a futile measure, against which the Presbyterian ministers preached fiercely. In March, Papists, delinquents, and soldiers of fortune were ordered to leave London and confined within a five-mile radius of their own parishes. Troops were sent into the western counties, a considerable force was concentrated in London, and a new, arbitrary Court of Justice was erected for the trial of offenders against the Commonwealth. Money was raised by the sale of delinquents' lands, new sequestrations were made daily, and harsh measure was dealt out to all suspected Royalists. But, notwithstanding all these precautions, the feeling of despondency remained, until the return of Cromwell from Ireland, early in June, somewhat alleviated the general apprehension. On June 12th-22nd Cromwell and Fairfax were appointed joint-commanders of the expedition which was to march against the Scots. Fairfax—who had already refused to take the Engagement—thereupon laid down his commission, and on June 28th-July 8th Cromwell set out in sole command, having with him Fleetwood as lieutenant-general, and Lambert as major-general. On July 19th-29th he mustered near Berwick 16,000 strong, and thence he issued a manifesto addressed

[1] *Burnet*, i. p. 105. Note by Lord Dartmouth.
[2] *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., xi. fol. 2.

'To all that are Saints and Partakers of the Faith of God's Elect in Scotland.' This document contained an elaborate justification of all the proceedings of 'the godly' in England, exhorted the Scots to abandon the belief that all religion was 'wrapped up' in the Covenant, and reproached them bitterly for their dealings with Charles Stuart . . . who has turned every stone and tried all his friends and allies in foreign parts and endeavoured commotions at home by his malignant instruments, commissioned Rupert, the French, and all that piratical generation to spoil, take, plunder, and destroy our ships and trade at sea, and to destroy the people of God and the peace of these nations. And now, being by his mother and the Popish interest abroad counselled thereto, he has made a compliance with you, as his last refuge, though, even while he was treating with you, he had set his heart upon Montrose . . . and upon his Popish army in Ireland . . . and would never be induced to close with the Covenant and Presbytery till utterly disappointed of all those malignant and Popish hopes.' Finally, the English general concluded with a fervent prayer, 'that the precious in Scotland may be separated from the vile, which is the end of this paper.'[1]

This appeal made, for the moment, little impression. Cromwell entered Scotland, the population fled before him, and, marching along the coast that the fleet might keep his army supplied with provisions, he reached Musselburgh unopposed.

This invasion had of course been anticipated by the Scots, and Livingstone had suggested that Charles should avert it by declaring that he did not at present intend 'to prosecute his right (in England) by the sword.' Rather to the minister's surprise, the King 'was not pleased to relish the notion,' and retorted sharply that he hoped Livingstone would not wish him 'to sell his father's blood.'[2] In truth he only endured the Scots

[1] *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. fol. 114, 20th-30th July 1650.
[2] Livingstone's *Life*, p. 184.

1650 May-July

because he hoped, through them, to regain England, where he expected a general insurrection—of which the details had been planned at Breda—so soon as Cromwell's army had been drawn off northward.

The Royalist party now consisted of a coalition of Cavaliers and Presbyterians, and the King, though naturally anxious that the Cavalier element should be strong, desired that his army should pass for a Presbyterian one, since, if it did not, the Scots would probably reject its alliance.[1] Moreover, it was from the Presbyterians that funds were to be raised for the enterprise, and through their influence it was hoped to gain London, where many wealthy citizens and most of the Presbyterian ministers were staunch partisans of the King. Throughout the year Royalists had been busy in all parts of the country, secretly collecting horses, arms, and ammunition, and Royalist gentlemen had been sent to stir up the loyalty of those districts in which they had interest. Thus Sir Philip Musgrave went to Cumberland and Westmoreland, Lord Willoughby of Parham to Lincoln, and Lord Derby to Lancashire. Others undertook to incite the London apprentices to rise and destroy the Council of State. The Marquis of Newcastle had been appointed commander of the North, with Lord Bellasys as his general of the horse. Lancashire, Cheshire, and the adjacent counties were in the charge of Lord Derby. The eastern counties were to be intrusted to the young Duke of Buckingham. Kent, Surrey, and Sussex were offered to the Duke of Richmond, but Richmond was dying of a broken heart, and refused to rouse himself from his state of morbid melancholy, pleading that he was 'no soldier.' Lord Gerard was therefore nominated in his stead. Lord Beauchamp and the Arundels commanded in the West, the Earl of Pembroke in South Wales, and the Marquis of Hertford was commander-in-chief of the whole country. Careful plans had been laid for the seizure of ports and strongholds. Von Karpfen was to land in Kent with

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 180. King to Beauchamp, 31st May 1650.

four thousand men; Massey was to come from Scotland with two thousand; there were reasonable hopes of aid from the Levellers; it was believed that the fleet would not be hostile, and that many of Cromwell's soldiers would desert to the King. Charles had even been assured that Fairfax—a staunch Presbyterian—could be won, and had sent to offer him large rewards if he would bring over the Parliamentary army to the Scots; but his resignation extinguished that hope, and the overture was not made.

It had been settled that the insurrection should begin in the West, as the point furthest from Scotland, and, the signal thus given, the whole country was to rise immediately and simultaneously. But at the end of May Beauchamp reported that the West was 'extremely overawed' by the Government troops, and could not move without the aid of two thousand men from the Continent. Charles promised that they should be sent, and, immediately after his arrival in Scotland, he wrote to beg the Prince of Orange to land a force at Torbay, and instructed him to obtain money for the purpose from a certain Alderman Bunce, who held the Presbyterian funds in Holland. He concluded with an earnest entreaty that his brother-in-law would not fail him in this matter, 'as ye thing that most nearly concerns me in this world. For all the assistance of the Scots will be vaine without such a concurrence as this; and the truth is they seek themselves and their own interests too much to be a solid ayd.'[1]

But William of Orange lacked, not the will, but the power to comply with this request, and, though Cromwell had marched away, the rising did not follow. The vigorous measures of the Government had disconcerted the conspirators, and immensely increased the difficulties and dangers in their way. Worse still, they distrusted one another. Without the Cavaliers the Presbyterians dared not rise, and the Cavaliers refused to make the

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xl. fol. 27.

first move, lest they should be deserted by their allies. Moreover, their ardour was somewhat cooled, for Charles, in endeavouring to please all parties, had only succeeded in alienating his best friends. The taking of the Covenant and the desertion of Montrose had disgusted the Cavaliers. The Presbyterians were shocked by the discovery of the negotiations at Rome, and by the English Government's opportune publication of an address to the Pope, wherein concessions were offered to Charles's Roman Catholic subjects, and it was stated that the King, 'while his father yet lived, was known to have good and natural inclination to the Catholic Faith.'[1] Finally, to both parties, the Scots were foreign foes, and patriotism was stronger than Royalism. 'Doubtless, there be but too many Cavaliers in Cromwell's army to oppose the Scots,'[2] wrote Hatton. And when Cromwell crossed the Border, July 22nd-August 1st, he left England quiet behind him.[3] 1650 July-August

The Scots were not unprepared to receive him. At the time of the King's landing an Act had been passed for the levying of additional forces, and an army of about 26,000 men had been drawn together, commanded, nominally, by the old Earl of Leven, but in reality by his lieutenant-general, David Leslie. Leslie's task was not an easy one. His army consisted for the most part of raw, untried material, and, though it was leavened by a considerable number of Engagers and Cavaliers, Leslie was aware that he would not long be permitted to retain these experienced soldiers, since the barons and burgesses, triumphing over the opposition of the nobles, had obtained a commission for 'purging' the army of 'Malignants.' Thus hampered by the interference of civilians and by the insubordination and dissensions of his own officers, the lieutenant-general wisely resolved to act on the defensive and entrenched

[1] *Mercurius Politicus*, 15th July 1650.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 190, 3rd-13th August 1650.

[3] *Coke's Confessions*, *Historical MSS.*, Rept. 14, App. i. pp. 567-603. *Tanner MSS.*, *Charles II. and Scotland*, p. 154. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. fols. 6, 9, 54. *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 178-99. *Gardiner*, i. pp. 278-300.

his army between Leith and Edinburgh, his line extending to the foot of the Canongate.

It was the King's most earnest desire to join the army, for he believed that, once among the soldiers, he would be able to win their hearts and form a party of his own. This was exactly what the Committee of Estates feared and intended to prevent. Charles was not permitted to go to the camp, but, as it was judged inadvisable that he should remain so far from the scene of action, it was decided to remove him to Dunfermline.

On July 23rd-August 2nd he left Falkland for Perth, where he was well received and sumptuously entertained by the provost and magistrates of the city. He remained there only one night and departed the next afternoon, inscribing, ere he went, the following words in the city *Book of Privileges*:—

'Charles R. 24 Julii 1650.
Nemo me impune lacessit.'

That same evening he arrived at Dunfermline, having on the way visited the Lord Burly, who showed him his 'cabinet of rarieties,' and presented him with a falcon on his departure.

At Dunfermline, where he was the guest of the Earl of that name, Charles found Mistress Anne Murray, the lady who had assisted the escape of his brother James. Mistress Murray, being aware that both her brother and her fiancé, Colonel Bampfylde, had incurred the royal displeasure, had not felt sure of the King's attitude towards herself, and had therefore written to Harry Seymour at Falkland, asking whether her Sovereign would be willing to receive her. Seymour replied cordially: 'His Majesty saith you shall be very welcome to him whensoever you will give yourself that trouble.' Accordingly Anne Murray came to Dunfermline, where she was presented to the King on his arrival by Argyle, together with the Lady Dunfermline and the Lady Anne Erskine. Charles received the ladies graciously, but he smiled on all alike, and Anne, who had expected to be

greeted as an old friend and to receive some acknowledgment of her share in James's rescue, was deeply chagrined. During the next few days she was constantly in the King's presence, and, though he did not fail to make himself agreeable to her, 'yett it was noe more than what he did to strangers.' On the last day of the royal visit she resolved to bear this neglect no longer, and sent for Richard Harding, to whom she related all her troubles, lamenting with tears that they were immeasurably aggravated by the fact that the King 'took no notice' of her. 'The good old gentleman' wept in sympathy and promised to speak to the King on her behalf. This he did with so much effect that, on the following day, Charles, having made his farewells to his hostess, came up to Anne and formally addressed her.

'Mrs. Murray,' he said, 'I am ashamed I have been so long a-speaking to you, but it was because I could not say enough to you for the service you did my brother. But, if ever I can command what I have a right to as my own, there shall be nothing in my power I will not do for you.' He then laid his hand on Anne's, which were clasped before her, and she bent to kiss it. A little more conversation followed and Charles then took his departure, leaving Anne Murray soothed and satisfied. Only a few weeks later she again earned his gratitude by the kindly care she gave to the wounded soldiers after the battle of Dunbar, dressing the wounds of all who were brought to her. This time the royal thanks came promptly, accompanied by the substantial gift of 'fifty pieces'—a part of the money presented to the King at Aberdeen. This sum, which Charles himself could ill spare, was the more welcome to Anne as she was entirely dependent on the charity of her friends.[1]

From Dunfermline the King went to Stirling and there, to his great joy, he received an invitation to join the army, delivered through the Earl of Eglinton, the

[1] *Autobiography of Anne Murray* (*Lady Halkett*). *Camden Miscellany*, New Series, xiii. pp. 58-61, 62-4. *Balfour*, iv. pp. 81-2.

1650 August colonel of his Horse Guards. Defying all opposition, he at once took horse and rode to Leith, where he was welcomed by the soldiers with the utmost enthusiasm. Cromwell had reached Musselburgh the day before, 28th July-7th August, and almost at the instant of the King's arrival, he opened proceedings with an attack on Leslie's right. An indecisive skirmish followed and Cromwell fell back to Musselburgh. A couple of days later the Scots retaliated; a party of Cromwell's horse was forced back by Colonel Montgomery, Eglinton's son, and Lambert was wounded before the Scottish attack was finally repulsed. The insubordination of Leslie's officers is well illustrated by the fact that the Earl of Wemyss, being ordered to sally out on this occasion, refused to go without his breakfast, which took four hours to prepare. And the General, hearing that the Earl was 'peaceably mynded' that morning, was obliged to send counter orders to save his own credit.

Meanwhile the King's popularity in the army was exciting the greatest uneasiness in the Committee of Estates. 'His coming bred much joy to the soldiery and courage, but grate confusion and neglect of duty in the campe,' says Balfour, and, on this plea, he was required to leave it. At first he demurred, but he was told that 'if he proved contumacious the Government would not act nor the ministers pray for the army, and on Friday, August 2nd-12th, he retired to Dunfermline 'sore against his awen mynd.'[1]

His departure was followed by a vigorous 'purging' of the army from the 'wicked and profane,' that is, wrote a correspondent to Nicholas, 'all those that ever served the last King.' It was better, said the ministers, to fight their enemies 'with a handful of elect and godly people, rather than with mighty arms loaden with sin.' And they preached diligently the expulsion of Malignants, declaring that 'God could not prosper them so long as those people remained amongst them.'

[1] *Balfour*, iv. pp. 86, 87. *Walker*, p. 163. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 193.

As a result nearly a hundred officers and over three thousand soldiers were dismissed from the army, as Engagers or Cavaliers, and their places filled by 'minister's sons, clerks, and such other sanctified creatures, who hardly ever saw or heard of any sword but that of the Spirit.' The offers of the gentry of Teviotdale to harass Cromwell's rear, and of others to raise forces for the King, were sternly rejected, and they were forbidden to fight on pain of forfeiture. Thus the efficiency of the Scottish army was considerably diminished. If only the King and the gentry had remained, said Lauderdale, 'the isle of Britain saw not such an army these hundred years.'[1]

But the Kirk was not satisfied, and it next required Charles to sign a declaration, drawn up in his name, which set forth his shame and sorrow for his own sins and those of his whole house, in particular for his father's opposition to the Covenant and for his mother's 'idolatry.' Further, it affirmed that he himself abhorred popery, superstition, idolatry, and prelacy; that he had not signed the Covenant 'with any sinister intent or crooked design for attaining his own ends'; that he renounced all loyalty not founded on the Covenant, and would have no enemies but those of the Covenant. Finally, it professed his conviction of his own 'sinfulness,' promised that he would always follow the advice of the Kirk, and hoped that his new-found 'godliness' would bring success to the Scottish army.[2]

When this document was first laid before Charles by Argyle, he absolutely refused to sign it, protesting that if he did so, he could 'never look his mother in the face again.'[3] Upon Argyle's report of his failure, a joint-committee from Kirk and Parliament was sent to press the matter on the King. Charles received his unwelcome visitors at midday, Friday, August 9-19, and told them

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 193. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. fol. 152; xi. fol. 5. *Walker*, pp. 162, 165.

[2] *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. fol. 138. [3] *Burnet*, i. p. 104.

curtly that they should have his answer when he returned from hunting. In this expectation they waited till evening, 'bot they received no contentment, the King deneying absolutely to declaire anything (that) might rube upon his father. So they depairted upon Saturday unsatisfied.' Three days later the Committee of the General Assembly of the Kirk issued a declaration that the King's refusal to sign was a 'just ground of stumbling' and that both army and Government were now absolved from the obligation to defend him. It proposed, therefore, to enter into treaty with Cromwell, declaring that 'kirk and kingdom do not own or espouse any malignant party, or quarrel or interest.' At the same time a similar declaration was sent from the army to the Committee of Estates. These declarations, ratified by the Committee of Estates, were brought to the King at Dunfermline on the afternoon of Wednesday, August 14. Charles saw himself about to be delivered up to the English, like his father before him, and realised that, without this last concession, all the shame and ignominy that he had previously suffered would have been suffered in vain. Moreover, Argyle was at hand to assure him of the danger of resistance, and to whisper words of consolation in his ear.

It was but a matter of form, a temporary expedient to content 'the madmen.' Once Cromwell's army were overthrown, the King should be free to do as he would. Again Charles yielded to the tempters; it may well have seemed to him that an oath or a declaration, more or less, could add little to the shame that was already his. After a brief conference with Argyle, Lorne, Lothian, and Eglinton, he summoned two ministers, David Dickson and Patrick Gillespie, 'to resolve his doubts,' and wrote to the Committee of Estates expressing his willingness to satisfy them, 'only he intreated them to be as sparing of his father's name as necessarily could be.'

The ministers came on Thursday, 15th-25th August, and on Friday, after a long dispute and the alteration of

certain phrases to a form which Charles conceived less insulting to his father's memory, the King signed the declaration desired of him. He was rewarded by the immediate bringing of the crown and sceptre from Stirling as an earnest of the future coronation. That same day he rode away to Perth, where he arrived at ten o'clock at night.[1]

There, a few days later, he received an emissary from Ireland, Dr. King, the Dean of Tuam. Such a person could not, of course, seek an audience openly, but Seymour contrived to admit him secretly to the King's bedchamber at one o'clock on the morning of Tuesday, August 20th, and, while the rest of the Court slept, the captive monarch, secure in the place and hour, unburdened his mind to the Dean.

'Mr. King, I have received a very good character of you,' he began, 'and I do therefore give you assurance that, however I am forced by the necessity of my affairs to appear otherwise, I am a true child of the Church of England, and shall remain firm unto my first principles. Mr. King, I am a true Cavalier!' After a pause he continued, in the same strain: 'Mr. King, the Scots have dealt very ill with me—very ill. I understand you are willing to go into Ireland. My Lord of Ormonde is a person that I depend upon more than any one living. I much fear that I have been forced to do some things which may much prejudice him. You have heard how a declaration was extorted from me, and how I should have been dealt withal if I had not signed it. Yet what concerns Ireland is in no ways binding, for I can do nothing in that kingdom without my council there: nor hath that kingdom any dependence upon this, so that what I have done is nothing, yet I fear it may prejudice my Lord of Ormonde and my friends with him, so that if you would satisfy him in this, you would do a very acceptable service unto me. . . . I have endeavoured to

[1] *Balfour*, iv. pp. 89-95. *Walker*, pp. 166-77. *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 397. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. fol. 152; xi. fol. 5.

send to my Lord of Ormonde very often, yet I do not find that he hath received anything from me since the treaty. I have endeavoured to the utmost to preserve him and my friends there, but I have been ill dealt withal. . . . For such of the Irish as have been loyal to me I will, by God's help, whatsoever my father or I have promised them, make good unto them. . . . I am resolved wholly to be governed in the affairs of that kingdom by my Lord of Ormonde.' Here Charles made another pause, endeavouring to recollect the names of those in Ireland to whom he desired to send particular messages, among whom were the Marquis of Clanricarde and the Lords Muskerry, Inchiquin, and Dillon. 'And tell them,' he concluded, 'that I prefer their particular safeties to any interest of my own in that kingdom, and that I account it not only an error but a misfortune that I came not thither when my Lord of Ormonde invited me.'[1]

These halting phrases, frequent repetitions, and lame excuses bear evidence of the genuineness of the Dean's report of the conversation. Did any doubt exist as to Charles's state of mind and the value of the oaths so recently extorted from him by the Scots, it would be solved by his own words; they need no commentary.

By this time a battle had become imperatively necessary to Cromwell. Storms had kept his commissariat vessels out at sea, he was short of supplies, the desolated country could not support his army, and his men 'fell sick beyond imagination.' In the hope of forcing Leslie to fight, he had advanced on the south of Edinburgh, attempting to cut off the city's communications with Fife, and on August 13th-23rd he encamped on Braid Hill. But a friendly message from Leslie, and a copy of the declaration disowning the King, sent by the Committee of the Kirk, caused him to stay his hand. For several days he waited in the hope that Charles's resistance to

[1] 'The Dean of Tuam's Conferences with the King': *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 391.

the Kirk would result in his final renunciation by the Scots, and his consequent surrender to the English as 'the cursed thing that troubles the peace of Israel.' Letters and messages, loaded with scriptural quotation, and proving to the satisfaction of the senders that they and they alone were the soldiers of the Lord, passed daily between the two armies. A treaty had actually been opened when Charles, yielding to the force of circumstance, dashed Cromwell's hopes and deprived him of his party among the Covenanters. 1650 September

Leslie had used the interval to strengthen himself, and on August 21st-31st he took up an impregnable position on a hill behind Corstorphine. His right wing was protected by impassable bogs, before him lay two wide lakes, and behind him were all the forces of the north and west. Not even the distress of Edinburgh, which was great, could draw Leslie from such a vantage ground, and when Cromwell advanced westwards, confident of battle, it was only to find his cavalry useless against bogs and stone-walls. Completely outmanœuvred and bitterly disappointed, he fell back on Braid Hill, then to Musselburgh, then to Haddington, and finally, September 1st-10th, to Dunbar. Leslie followed slowly, and, by a masterly movement, contrived to pass his whole army round that of Cromwell and establish it on a ridge of the Lammermuir Hills, overlooking Dunbar. At the same time he sent a party of cavalry to hold the pass at Cockburnspath, on the way to Berwick. Cromwell's retreat by land was thus cut off, and, if he retreated by sea, he would certainly have to abandon his horses, probably a part of his army, since he had not ships enough to convey the whole force. Yet he knew that he must either retreat or fight, for the country was barren, and his men were dying daily of starvation and fever. Leslie knew it also, and had the Scots been content to 'sit still' and let disease and famine do their work, all might have gone well. But such a prudent course by no means suited the ministers of the Kirk, who, despising

1650 3rd-13th September

the judgment of the generals, clamoured for battle, promising the victory to their own side 'in as confident terms as if God himself had directed them to declare it.' Their clamour prevailed, and on September 2nd-12th, a formal order from the Committee of Estates bade Leslie fight. Sorely against his own will, he descended the hill and took up his position at its foot on the south bank of a stream which ran through a deep ravine, drawing his right wing down towards the shore. Cromwell did not immediately attack, and during the day Leslie gathered confidence. His own position was tolerably secure; it was possible that the enemy had already shipped their guns, and he thought to catch them in the act of embarking.

The night was wet, and many of the Scottish officers left their posts, seeking shelter from the rain. The English, on the other hand, spent the night in drawing up their plan of battle, and, when the moon shone out at four in the morning, they lost no time in getting to work. Lambert was to turn the guns on the Scottish main body, repulsing any attempt to cross the ravine, while Cromwell, sweeping round to Leslie's right, was to take him on the flank and force the wing back on the centre. The manœuvre was a complete success. At six o'clock Lambert brought up the guns and opened the attack on the front as Cromwell charged the right wing. The numbers of the Scots doubled those of the English, but their morale had been destroyed by the 'purging' of the army and the subsequent appointment of incompetent officers, who were moreover strangers to their men. The soldiers had no confidence in their leaders, and, after a brief resistance, the cavalry broke and fled, trampling down the infantry who were coming to their support. The fight lasted but an hour and was rather a rout than a battle. The flying army was caught between the hills and the ravine; three thousand of them fell in the pursuit, ten thousand were taken prisoners and sent to England, where they died, for the most part, of starvation

and dysentery; all the cannon, ammunition, colours, and baggage remained in the hands of the enemy. The army of the Covenant was completely overthrown, while the English losses were infinitesimal. 'I do not believe we have lost twenty men!' wrote Cromwell to the Speaker.[1]

Edinburgh, Leith, and, a few weeks later, Glasgow were occupied by the conquerors, and on the 24th of December the castle of Edinburgh also surrendered. The manses were rifled, the kirks became stables, and the ministers found themselves supplanted by Lambert and Cromwell, who preached with sword and pistol at their sides. The conquest of southern Scotland was complete.

[1] Gardiner's *Commonwealth*, i. pp. 301-29. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., ix. p. 152.

CHAPTER IX

Results of the Battle of Dunbar—Buckingham—The Start—Improved Position of the King—Remonstrants and Resolutioners—Malignants restored—Coronation—The King's Policy—The New Army—Argyle leaves the King—English Royalists betrayed—Precautions of the Government—The March to Worcester—The Defeat of Derby—The King at Worcester—The Battle—The Flight—The Fate of the Prisoners—Effects of the Defeat.

1650 September

THE astonishment of the ministers of the Kirk exceeded their chagrin at the unexpected defeat of their champions. 'They now told God Almighty,' says Walker, 'that it was a small thing to them to lose their lives and estates, but to Him it was a very great loss to suffer his elect and chosen to be destroyed.'[1] A new declaration published by the Assembly of the Kirk ascribed the defeat to the King's hypocrisy 'in complying with them not for conscience but for the love of a crown,' to the presence of malignants in Court and army, to the nation's trust in carnal weapons and too great zeal for the King's interests. These 'causes of defeat' were to be publicly read in the churches, and King and nation were to be called upon to repent of their shortcomings.

On all sides were heard mutual recriminations, and accusations of cowardice, sinfulness, neglect, and treason. Leslie resigned his command and wrote to the King, to demand an inquiry into his 'deportmentis' at Dunbar. 'I did sincerlie, according to the licht and knolig God hath conferrid on me, indevor the subduing of that enime,' he protested, 'notwithstanding many aspertions

[1] *Walker*, p. 182.

are cast on me quwhich the Lord hath inablid me, with sum measure of patience, to bear.'

As there was in reality small ground for these 'aspertions,' and no general competent to fill Leslie's place, he was entreated to return to his duties, which he did, retiring to Stirling with five thousand men.[1]

To Charles the result of the battle was no unmitigated misfortune. He had written piously enough to the Committee of Estates owning the disaster to be a just punishment 'for our sins and those of our House and of the whole land,' and exhorting his subjects to bear the blow in the strength of 'religion, the Gospel, and the Covenant'; but his own sorrow was small.[2]

He had learnt to dread the victory of the Covenanters as the greatest possible danger to himself, and, on the very day of the battle, he had written to Nicholas bidding him provide a way of escape by sending a Dutch herring-boat to lie off the Scottish coast. 'I shall only say this to you,' he concluded wrathfully, 'that you cannot imaien the vilany of the (Covenanters) and their party. Indeed it has done me a great deal of good, for nothing could have confirmed me more to the Church of England than being here and seeing their hypocrisy.'[3]

That same evening came the news of the defeat to Perth. It was communicated to the King by Argyle, and report said that Charles immediately fell on his knees and gave thanks for the destruction of his enemies. The story is an improbable one; Charles was not addicted to falling on his knees, and he was far too politic to reveal his sentiments so openly.

He perceived, like Cromwell, that 'the Kirk had done its do' and that a reaction in his own favour was likely to follow, but there was still need to walk warily. Johnston of Warriston traced all mishaps to the sins of the Stuarts, and a proposal to readmit repentant Engagers

[1] *Thurloe State Papers*, i. p. 167. *Baillie, Letters*, iii. p. 111.
[2] *Thurloe State Papers*, i. p. 163.
[3] Evelyn's *Diary* (ed. 1879), iv. pp. 198-9.

to the service of the State, albeit supported by both Leslie and Argyle, was rejected by Kirk and Parliament. Chiesly declared that he would sooner join Cromwell; it was believed that Colonel Strachan, who had been sent with Ker to raise new forces in the 'Whiggamore West,' was plotting to deliver the King up to the English, and a letter, sent by him to Cromwell, was actually intercepted by Leslie. On the other hand, the forces gathered in the Highlands were all 'at the King's devotion,' and the whole of Fife was loyally inclined, even to the ministers, who refused to read the 'Causes for Public Humiliation' published by the General Assembly, and voted them 'unchristian and uncharitable.'[1]

Charles believed that his hour had come, and while he 'amused' Argyle with promises to make him a duke, a gentleman of the Bedchamber, and even to pay the arrears owed by the English Parliament to the Scots for their share in the first Civil War, he was secretly forming a party of Engagers and Royalists who would, he hoped, deliver him for ever from the power of the Kirk and the Campbells.

His agents in this affair were his physician, Dr. Fraser, and Harry Seymour, both of whom had been banished from Court for advising the King to reject the declaration of August 16th-26th.[2] Since their banishment they had been in constant communication with Lauderdale and with many of the Royalists and Engagers who were awaiting better times in the Highlands. Among these were Sir Thomas Middleton, an experienced soldier, who had commanded the cavalry of Hamilton's Engagement, and many of the Scottish nobles, including the Marquis of Huntly, the Earls of Airlie and Athol, and the Lords Ogilvie, Murray, Lindsay, and St. Clair. Fraser, a person of an 'unquiet and over-active spirit,' conceived an exaggerated idea of the strength and numbers of these malcontents, and contrived to report to the King that a

[1] *Walker*, p. 182-7. *Balfour*, iv. pp. 107, 108.
[2] *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., xi. fol. 2. *Walker*, p. 188.

force comprising sixty nobles, one thousand gentlemen, and ten thousand men was ready to rise for him in the Highlands.

Charles, grasping eagerly at the hope held out to him, promised to join them in person, and named the 3rd-13th of October as the day of rendezvous. The Committee of Estates had already appointed that date for a fresh purging of the King's 'Malignant' Horse Guards, ten miles off, at Kinross. Charles therefore instructed the lieutenant-colonel, Lord Newburgh, to seize the purgers and escape with his men into Fife, where he himself would speedily join them. Perth was to be seized by Highlanders, concealed in the town, and the men of Athol were to pour in to their assistance. The King would then publish a declaration setting forth the ill-treatment he had suffered from Argyle and the Parliament, and it was believed that most of the gentry and the greater part of Leslie's army would rally to his side.

Only three 'broken regiments' of the Covenanting army lay north of the Tay, and the plot might have prospered but for the treachery of Buckingham. The young Duke had been deeply involved with the Hamiltons, and had played a part in the war of 1648 in which his brother, Francis Villiers, had fallen; but he had now 'cast off' the Hamiltons as 'unuseful,' and devoted himself to Argyle, who, in consideration of his great influence with the King, overlooked his former offences. The Villiers, as the adopted children of Charles I., had been brought up in the closest intimacy with the royal family, and partly to this circumstance, but more to his remarkable personality, Buckingham owed his power with the King, whose senior he was by three years. He had all the beauty and fascination of his father, with a brilliant wit that the first Duke had not boasted. So graceful were his movements that, if he did but walk across a room, all eyes were turned to follow him, and 'he had the art of turning persons and things into ridicule beyond any man of his age.' 'He was the finest gentleman

of person and wit, I think, I ever saw,' wrote Sir John Reresby, and his vanity, selfishness, and absolute lack of principle or generosity could not obviate, in the eyes of Charles at least, the charm of his 'noble presence' and 'great liveliness of wit.'[1] To this friend of his childhood, then, the usually reticent King confided his schemes as they rode together on the morning of October 2nd. Buckingham perceived that the downfall of Argyle and the restoration of the Hamiltons would be fatal to himself, since his former friends were not likely to look with favour on their faithless ally. Making some slight excuse, he immediately turned his horse and hastened back to Perth, where he revealed to Wilmot all that the King had said. Wilmot was in much the same predicament as Buckingham, and the two between them resolved to frustrate the scheme and persuade the King to abandon it. 'That night in the Bedchamber the business was hotly disputed for some hours,' until Charles at last, thoroughly wearied and disheartened, yielded to his subjects' insistence, and agreed to send messengers to forbid the rising.

But the secret had already been betrayed by Wilmot to Argyle and by Argyle to the Committee of Estates. It was immediately decided to cashier the King's Horse Guards, employing the Foot Guards to enforce submission, and to insist on the banishment of Malignants from Court. The list of the proscribed included, this time, the Lords Cleveland, Wentworth, Grandison, and Wilmot, the French Marquis de Villeneuve and Vicomte de St. Paul, Sir Edward Walker, Sir Philip Musgrave, and other less distinguished persons, among whom were 'Mr. Marsh and Mr. Lane whose crimes, if any, were merry and loyal hearts,' and Wyndham, 'for being of Malignant parents.' Even Sir George Melville, Master of the Household and a strict Presbyterian, was to be dismissed 'for being dutiful to the King and civil to his servants,'

[1] *Reresby Memoirs*, p. 40. *Burnet*, i. pp. 96, 183. *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. pp. 47, 49. *Jesse*, iii. p. 77.

as Walker affirmed. All were to leave the Court within twenty-four hours and the kingdom within twenty days. 1650 October

Charles was informed of this sentence by Sir James Balfour on the morning of October 3rd. After reading the list of names, twenty-four in all, he marked nine, and begged Balfour to delay the execution of his orders until he himself had spoken with the Chancellor. But the morrow brought Loudoun, the Chancellor, with a stern refusal to show mercy; the Committee of Estates would no longer brook defiance, and the gentlemen of the household were required to depart forthwith. In the meantime messages of remonstrance had been sent by the Royalist leaders, who pointed out that it was now too late to draw back, and the King, having ascertained from Lothian that an indemnity would not be granted them, resolved to throw in his lot with theirs. That same day, October 4th-14th, he dined early, and, after dinner, strolled out into the garden. There a new dispute took place with Buckingham, which lasted half an hour; but finally Charles went out by the garden gate with Progers, Lane, Wyndham, and several others, and, taking horse, rode off towards Fife, 'without any change of clothes or linens more than was on his body, in a thin riding sute of stuffe.' Lorne was absent, attending a soldier's funeral, and though Buckingham and Dunfermline gave chase, they failed to overtake the King. The Committee of Estates, in great alarm, closed the town gates, and despatched Colonel Montgomery in pursuit of the fugitive.

Charles crossed the Tay at a ferry, and, 'riding at a full career,' reached the house of Lord Dudhope, near Dundee, at about three o'clock in the afternoon. There he found Lauderdale and Balcarres, who begged him to return before it was too late. Scorning their advice, he rode on with Dudhope to Lord Buchan's place, and thence, with Dudhope, Buchan, and Ogilvy, to the house of the Earl of Airlie, 'an excommunicated Papist.' There a guard of some eighty Highlanders gathered round the

King, and, after a brief halt for refreshment, he continued his flight to Clova, where he hoped to meet Huntly. In this he was disappointed; but by that time night had fallen, and men and horses were both weary, having travelled forty-two miles with hardly a break. It was decided, therefore, to rest for some hours in 'ane poure cottage' belonging to the Laird of Clova, and there the foremost of Montgomery's officers found the King at daybreak, 'laying in a nastie roume, on ane old bolster, above a matte of segges and rushes, over-wearied and verey fearfull.'

These officers, Nairn and Boynton, had been sent on in advance, charged with 'large offers' to induce the King's return. They promised complete indemnity for himself and his friends, and Charles listened to their representations with patience. Progers, however, interposed, warning him not to trust them, and he rose at last with the intention of again taking flight. But at the door he met Montgomery himself, who had followed close on the heels of his emissaries. There was a second agitated discussion. Charles averred that his flight had been occasioned by a warning of the committee's intention to give him up to Cromwell and hang his faithful servants. Montgomery protested that the tale was false; that he himself was ready 'to live and die' with his Sovereign, and vowed to 'set him *in statu quo* or die at his feet.' Dudhope as passionately urged flight to the hills, where a force of two thousand horse and five thousand foot was already gathered, and Charles found himself, as usual, 'distracted with a variety of opinions.' The debate was concluded at last by the arrival of Montgomery's regiments, when the King, seeing that little choice remained to him, consented to be conducted to Huntly Castle. Progers accompanied him, only to be dismissed next day, and, though Montgomery passed his word for their safety, Buchan, Dudhope, and Seymour declined to return. So also did Lord Newburgh, who had started for Aberdeen with the Horse Guards. His men came back without

him, and the gentry of Fife, who had mustered at Dundee, dispersed to their homes or fled to Middleton, in the Highlands.

Charles slept that night at Huntly Castle, where he was joined next day, Sunday, October 6th-16th, by Buckingham, Lorne, and a select committee, of which Lothian was the chief. These brought 'a mild and discreet letter' from the Committee of Estates, which assured the King that he should be free henceforth to choose his own residence, but begged him, as a favour, to return to Perth. He consented to go at once, and arrived in Perth the same afternoon, where he 'heard sermon in his own Presence Chamber, the afternoon sermon being ended before he entered the town.'[1]

So ended the adventure known as The Start; but, futile though it seemed, it wrought a very important change in the King's position. Athol was in arms for him, a considerable force stood out for him in the Highlands, and he had clearly demonstrated that there was a limit to his endurance. In the disastrous condition of their affairs the Committee of Estates dared no longer treat him as a negligible quantity, and on Thursday, October 10th-20th, he was permitted, for the first time, to sit in council. Thenceforth he had a voice in all public matters, and, in return for this privilege, he apologised to the committee for the part he had taken in 'the late unhappy business,' which, he assured them, 'befell him by the wicked counsel of some men who had deluded him.' He did not scruple to add that, 'as he was a Christian, when he first went out he had no mind to depart; and he trusted in God it would be a lesson to him all the days of his life.'[2]

It had undoubtedly been a lesson to the Committee of Estates; the King's protestations deceived no one, and, as he steadily refused to order his friends to lay down

[1] *Balfour*, iv. pp. 109-15. *Baillie*, iii. p. 117. *Miscellanea Aulica*, pp. 152-3. *Walker*, pp. 196-200. *Carte*, *Letters*, i. p. 389.

[2] *Balfour*, iv. p. 118.

arms without definite assurance of their safety, an Act of Indemnity for the men of Athol was passed on the 12th-22nd of October. Further, it was promised that the same terms should be granted to the Royalists in the north, if demanded by them.[1] The fulfilment of this promise was not immediately required. Middleton and his party continued in arms with some success, routed a small force sent against them, and drew up an agreement called 'the Northern Bond,' in which they pledged themselves to fight for King and religion, and called upon the whole nation to unite against the English foe. The Government, seeing them grow formidable, ordered Leslie to disperse them, and on October 25th, after a long private conference with the King, he crossed the Tay with three thousand horse. He had gone but a day's march northward when he received a letter from Middleton pointing out that their causes were really one; the letter was accompanied by a copy of the Northern Bond, which bore the signatures of Huntly, Athol, Seaforth, Sir George Munro, and Middleton himself, with many others. Leslie, mindful of the King's instructions, readily entertained the overture, and a week later, on the 4th-14th of November, the Royalists accepted an Act of Indemnity, and laid down their arms at Strathbogie.[2]

But the troubles of the Government were not thus ended. Its latitudinarian attitude was exceedingly displeasing to all strict adherents of the Covenant, and in particular to the forces of Ker and Strachan, gathered in the western districts of Renfrew, Ayr, Clydesdale, Galloway, and Nithsdale. To these no compromise was possible, and on the 17th-27th of October they issued a violent 'Remonstrance,' repudiating the King as a person whose 'whole deportment and private conversation showed a secret enmity to the work of God,' and disclaiming any right to force him on England. After

[1] *Balfour*, iv. p. 123. *Walker*, p. 201.
[2] *Balfour*, iv. pp. 127-32.

rehearsing his 'unstraight dealings' and persistent correspondence with 'notorious enemies of the work of reformation,' such as Ormonde and Newcastle, they adduced the episode of the Start as proof of his present insincerity, declared the treaty with him a sin from the beginning, and urged that he should now be suspended until he gave satisfactory proof of repentance and amendment. On receipt of this manifesto the Committee of Estates despatched a deputation to pacify the western army, but, though Argyle and Cassilis were among its members, the deputation laboured in vain; Strachan resigned his command, and Ker flatly refused to attempt the relief of Borthwick Castle, then besieged by the English.[1] 1650 November

Finding them thus recalcitrant, the Committee of Estates voted the 'Remonstrance' scandalous, passed a 'Resolution' that persistence in it was 'contrary to the laws of the kingdom,' and ordered Montgomery to march against Ker. The Committee of the Kirk refused to join in this resolution, maintaining that the Remonstrance contained 'sad truths,' and the result was a sharp schism among the Covenanters, who were now divided into Remonstrants and Resolutioners. On November the 26th the Parliament met at Perth, took into consideration the petitions of 'Malignants,' and voted the restoration of Hamilton, Seaforth, Lauderdale, and Newburgh. The General Assembly of the Kirk marked its disapproval by refusing to sit at all, whereupon the Parliament declared itself competent to act without the co-operation of the Kirk.[2] Ker had meanwhile been overthrown by Lambert, Strachan had fled to Cromwell, and the western army was totally destroyed. Plainly the clerical tyranny that had so long prevailed was doomed; and, though a minority of the ministers preferred to join with Cromwell, the majority decided to countenance what they could not prevent, and to receive

[1] *Burnet*, i. p. 103. *Balfour*, iv. pp. 123, 141-6. *Baillie*, iii. p. 118.
[2] *Balfour*, iv. pp. 172-6, 202, 205.

1650 December

back into the bosom of the Kirk any 'Malignant' who made a profession of penitence.

From that hour King, Covenanters, Royalists, and Engagers vied with one another in hypocrisy and compliance. Strachan was excommunicated by the Kirk, and 'delivered to the Devil in the Church of Perth.' The King declared an undying devotion to the Covenant. The Loyalists took the Covenant for form's sake, and, clothed in sackcloth, made public profession of repentance in the churches. Kirk and Parliament accepted their profession, and restored them politically and ecclesiastically, knowing the whole thing to be a mockery.

'Behold a fearfull sinne!' wrote Sir James Turner, himself one of the pretended penitents. 'The ministers of the Gospel resaved all our repentances as unfained, though they knew well enough they were bot counterfeit; and we, on the other hand, made no scruple to declare that Engadgment to be unlawful and sinneful, deceitfullie speaking against the dictates of our owne consciences and judgments. If this was not to mock the All-knoweing and All-seeing God to his face, then I declare myself not to know what the fearful sinne of hypocrisie is.'[1]

Charles was at last in a position to insist on being crowned, and the first day of January 1651 was appointed for the ceremony. Preparatory to this two national fasts were ordered, the one to be kept for the general 'contempt of the Gospel,' the other for the sins of the Stuarts, and the King was required to mourn publicly for the sins of his father and grandfather. Charles no longer knew shame or scruple, and complied without demur, only remarking at the close of the ordeal, 'I think I must repent, too, that ever I was born.'[2]

The coronation took place at Scone with all due ceremony, only the anointing being omitted as a super-

[1] *Memoirs of Sir J. Turner*, p. 94. Burnet's *Dukes of Hamilton*, vii. p. 21. *Balfour*, iv. p. 240.

[2] Somers's *Tracts*, vi. pp. 118-41. Gardiner's *Commonwealth*, i. p. 385.

stitious rite. The King was brought from his bed-chamber by the Constable and Marshal of the kingdom and conducted by a large train of nobles to the Kirk. There a sermon was preached by Robert Douglas, Moderator of the General Assembly, much in the usual strain of warning and admonition. Prayer followed, after which the Covenants were read, and the King, kneeling, signed them, and repeated the oath previously administered to him by the commissioners off the coast of Scotland. He was then placed in the chair of state and presented to the people by the Lyon King-at-Arms as the 'rightful and undoubted heir of the crown.' For a few moments he stood while the people shouted 'God save the King,' but sat to take the coronation oath to maintain religion and the laws of the kingdom. That done, he knelt again, and, with uplifted hand, swore 'By the Eternal and Mighty God, who liveth and reigneth for ever, I shall observe and keep all that is contained in this oath.' Next came the investiture with the royal robes, sword, and spurs; the Earl of Crawford placed the sceptre in his hand and Argyle put the crown on his head, while the ministers prayed that it might be purged from the sins of the King's ancestors. The nobles took the oath of allegiance, kneeling and touching the crown, and the King was finally installed on the throne by Argyle. A second sermon, more prayers, and an exhortation to the people to be true to King and Covenant followed, and the ceremony ended at last with the twentieth psalm. The King returned to the palace, crown on head and sceptre in hand, with the sword of state carried before him, and was hailed with acclamation by the populace. Subsequently the ministers testified that the King had behaved throughout the ceremony 'very seriously and devoutly, so that none doubted of his ingenuity and sincerity.'

1651 January

The coronation was no empty form. Charles was now a real king, endowed with a real authority, and held in considerable esteem among his subjects. Thenceforth he

sat regularly in Parliament, where he 'spoke much,' and took an active part in the raising of a new army. His reputation abroad was immediately improved; his friends were encouraged, and his enemies proportionately disconcerted.[1]

The power of Argyle was shaken, the star of Hamilton again in the ascendant, the feud between the two broke out as hotly as ever, and in the middle of January the Marquis retired to the Highlands that he might not witness his rival's return to Court. 'Argyle and Hamilton will only be reconciled by the death of one,' wrote Nicholas, 'and, I conceive, if they were both in heaven it would be never the worse for the King and the public, even of both kingdoms.'[2]

The King himself was of another opinion. He had a real regard for Hamilton; and, despite the reproaches of Buckingham, Loudoun, and Lothian, 'who did check the King much for his inconstancy, as they called it, in deserting his best friends that brought him to this country and put the crown on his head,' he allowed it to be clearly understood that the Duke enjoyed his favour.[3] On the other hand, intending to be King of the nation, not of a faction, he showed no desire to break definitely with Argyle. On the contrary, he accepted Argyle's nominee, Dr. Cunningham, as his physician in lieu of Fraser, admitted two Presbyterians, Colonel Graves and Captain Titus, to the places formerly filled by Progers and Seymour in the Bedchamber, and gave the secretaryship vacated by Long to Colonel Leighton, an unstable personage, who happened, just then, to be 'a perfect Presbyterian,' and whose 'ready wit and promptness of speech' had won him the affection and confidence of Buckingham.[4] More than all this, Charles at last pro-

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 389, 405.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 224.

[3] *Carte, Letters*, ii. p. 25. *Balfour*, iv. p. 274. *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 49.

[4] *Walker*, p. 177. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 208. *Balfour*, iv. p. 127.

posed to send Titus to France, to ask the Queen's consent to his marriage with Anne Campbell. Argyle, in return, acquiesced in the King's retention of Harding, Wilmot, Wentworth, and such others of his English train as had not already left Scotland, and suggested that Jermyn and Holles—who had broken with the Commonwealth party in England—should be invited to Scotland to act as Secretaries of State.

Titus was accordingly despatched on 21st January 1651, instructed by Charles to represent to the Queen the difficulties in the way of forming a foreign alliance, the power and merit of Argyle, and the advantages likely to accrue both in England and Scotland from the King's Presbyterian marriage. Argyle, for his part, bade Titus remind Henrietta of the ancient friendship so long existent between France and Scotland, assuring her that, when her son's position was secured, she should be restored to a place of honour at his side. He added also protestations of the great trust and confidence that he reposed in Jermyn.

It is not conceivable that Charles desired Titus to succeed in his mission. He disliked Jermyn, and can certainly have had no wish to marry Argyle's daughter, though, if Anne Murray is to be believed, the offered bride was charming enough. 'For,' says that lady, 'she was very handsome, extremely obliging, and her behaviour and dress was equal to any I had seen at the Court of England.'[1] But Charles thought, no doubt, that he could trust both his mother and Jermyn to refuse his requests, and counted on Titus being several months absent, during which time hope would keep Argyle in fairly good-humour. Nor was he disappointed. Jermyn was 'exceedingly exalted' by the invitation, but far too prudent to accept it; and, though Titus reached the Louvre early in March, it was the end of May before he reappeared in Scotland, bearing the Queen's discreet refusal of her consent. There was, she said, no objection to either

[1] *Autobiography*, p. 57.

1651 February

father or daughter, nor would the King's marriage with a subject be a thing 'new or extraordinary.' Yet it might arouse jealousies in Scotland and give offence to the English, who could not, as things then stood, be consulted in the matter. 'I cannot think fit to give any other advice than that the thing remains for a while in the same estate it doth,' she concluded, 'by which he (the King) will have the opportunity, if the difficulties that now occur should be removed, to go then seasonably through with it.'[1]

Charles had, in the meantime, devoted himself to gathering together a new army, a task in which he displayed an untiring energy and extraordinary ability, surprising to both friend and foe. Nothing was too trivial to claim his attention, nothing too troublesome for his undertaking, and his ready tact and personal charm enabled him to smooth over difficulties, conciliate hostile interests, and rally all to his own standard with an ease and rapidity that was truly marvellous. Cromwell himself testified that 'the young man' was 'very active and intelligent,'[2] and Sir Richard Fanshaw wrote enthusiastically: 'The best is . . . that his Majesty's judgment and activity both in civil and martial affairs are (developed) to a degree you would not imagine in so few months' growth as he hath trod the stage; (he) being the first and forwardest upon every occasion in either kind, and adventuring his person—I pray God not too much—upon every show of danger, riding continually and being up early and late: with which never-the-less his health is not abated, but, on the contrary, both that and his Majesty's strength increased.'[3]

Charles had begun his work by writing to all the shires and Highland chiefs urging them to make fresh levies. Throughout February he himself was busily engaged in

[1] Secret Instructions to Titus; Hillier's *Attempted Escapes of Charles I.*, pp. 328-33. *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 222-5. *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 408, 422-3.

[2] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 348.

[3] *Carte, Letters*, ii. p. 15.

inspecting the garrisons and defences of the east coast. On February 1st he personally superintended the fortification of the Forth where it was fordable, after which he visited the garrison of Stirling. From Stirling he went north to Burntisland, Wemyss, Anstruther, Crail, and St. Andrews, a journey which occupied fifteen days. For a couple of nights he was the guest of Lord Crawford, but February 17th found him in Perth. Three days later he set out for Dundee, accompanied by Newburgh, Eglinton, Lauderdale, and the still irreconcilable Argyle and Hamilton. On Saturday, February 22nd, he was at Kinnaird, on Monday at Dunnottar Castle, and on Tuesday he reached Aberdeen, where difficulties had arisen owing to the Kirk's objection to the levying of soldiers by Middleton. The King's presence quickly overcame all opposition, and he returned, with increased confidence, to meet his Parliament at Perth. He next proposed to choose a new committee of war, on which the Engagers should be largely represented; and here again, notwithstanding the adverse votes of Argyle and Lothian, he had his own way. By the end of March the new committee was appointed, the King himself was named Commander-in-Chief, David Leslie General of the Horse and Lieutenant-General of the whole army, and Middleton, Montgomery, and Massey Generals of Division under him. Hamilton, Huntly, Athol, Balcarres, Dunfermline, and many others raised private regiments among their own retainers and vassals for the King's service. Massey joined with an English troop of eight hundred horse; gentlemen not provided with a command were invited to form themselves into volunteer troops, and members of all parties, whether Scottish or English, were made welcome to the royal army.[1]

1651 February-June

By the end of May, a force of 20,000 men was in the field, and, on June 22nd, the King's triumph was completed by the repeal of the Act of Classes. The equality of Covenanter, Engager, and Cavalier was thus re-estab-

[1] *Balfour*, iv. pp. 214, 243, 245-9, 274-7. Burnet's *Hamiltons*, vii. p. 22.

1651 June

lished before the law, and the Malignants signed, in return, a bond to uphold religion and seek no vengeance for the past.[1] 'The King's power is absolute,' wrote the Dean of Tuam on June 8th, 'all interests are received, all factions composed, the ambitious defeated, the army cheerful, accomplished, numerous.' And in a later letter to Ormonde, he added: 'It is abundant matter for joy, in which your lordship will largely share, to observe the daily acts of his Majesty's prudence, vigilance, and high resolution in the conduct of his affairs!'[2]

It was true indeed that the nation was again united beneath the royal standard, and the power of Argyle was for ever overthrown. The moment for which Charles had looked, when he strove with the commissioners at Breda, was come at last. He had won the victory; won it, in a great measure, by his own wonderful address and ability, but paid for it too with a price—the price of his honour.

Yet to be King of a corner of Scotland was not what he had sought, and Cromwell still lay beyond the Forth, in such complete possession of the southern shires that Sir Alexander Hope and the Earl of Roxburgh had both seen fit to suggest a compromise by which the English general should be left in undisturbed possession of his conquests, on his undertaking to leave the King unmolested in the North. But such pusillanimous counsel suited Charles not at all, and he scorned it, as he had scorned Livingstone's advice to relinquish England. He would have all, or nothing, and in the beginning of June he gathered his army round Stirling.[3]

In the same month Cromwell, whom a severe illness had kept long inactive, again took the field. Then ensued a repetition of the tactics that had preceded the battle of Dunbar. Cromwell, with an army of veterans, at a distance from his base, and short of supplies, desired battle. Leslie, with a heterogeneous force of undisciplined and

[1] *Balfour*, iv. p. 301.
[2] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fols. 518, 537.
[3] *Balfour*, iv. p. 249.

inexperienced recruits, and amply provided with all necessaries, preferred to act on the defensive, and starve his enemy out. On the 28th of June he established himself at Torwood, on the hills south of Stirling. Cromwell followed him and endeavoured for a fortnight to bring on a battle, making repeated attempts to take or surround Stirling. Finding all his efforts vain, he resolved to cross the Forth, and, on the 17th of July, he succeeded in throwing a part of his army into Fife, below Queensferry. Three days later Lambert defeated and captured Sir John Brown, gaining possession of a pass north of the Forth.[1] Cromwell was thus enabled to cross the river with his main body, and, sending orders to Harrison to guard the English borders, he went rapidly through Fife, took Perth after a day's siege, and placed himself between Perth and Stirling. By this manœuvre he cut off the main source of the Scottish supplies and divided Leslie from Middleton, who had gone north to hasten Huntly's levies. He also left the south exposed to the Scottish army. 1651 July

Three courses were now possible to Charles. He might risk a battle with Cromwell, retreat into the Western Highlands, or march on England, whither the way lay open before him. The last course appealed to him most strongly. Battle could not now be given except on conditions of advantage to Cromwell, the possible retreat was 'no kingly prospect,' and, though the dash for England involved enormous risks, there was everything to gain by it, and—in the opinion of Charles at least—little to lose. Hamilton supported this opinion, not in any sanguine spirit, but with the courage of despair. 'I would fain say something more encouraging than my last was, but I cannot lie,' he wrote to his niece two days before he left Stirling. . . . 'Since the enemy shuns fighting with us except upon advantage, we must either starve, disband, or go with a handful of men into England. This last seems to be the least ill, yet it appears very

[1] *Balfour*, iv. p. 313.

desperate to me for more reasons than I will trouble you with.'[1]

Argyle opposed the project with 'reasons that were not frivolous,'[2] but his opposition was vain. Charles was so weary of his life that he preferred any dangers to an indefinite prolongation of the existing conditions, and he longed passionately to set foot again in his beloved England. Hopeless and disgusted, Argyle and Loudoun left the army and retired into private life. Many others followed their example, soldiers and officers deserting in large numbers so soon as the King's decision was made known. But the departure of some of these was not regretted. 'All the rogues have left us; I will not say whether for fear or disloyalty,' wrote Hamilton, and Charles's resolution was unshaken.[3] Leaving Crawford to raise and defend the North, he broke up his camp on the 31st of July-11th August, and set out for Carlisle.

Cromwell must have expected—had probably desired—such a consummation, and heard of it without alarm. He immediately despatched an express messenger to warn the English Council of State of what had occurred, promising to overtake the Scots before they could give any trouble in England. On the 2nd of August he started in pursuit, having garrisoned Perth and left Monk with six thousand men to reduce Stirling. Lambert, with most of the cavalry, was sent in advance to follow close on the enemy's rear; Harrison was ordered to hang on their flank, and Cromwell, with the rest of the army, followed more slowly. He was imbued with too profound a contempt for the fighting powers of the Scots to have much doubt of the result of their enterprise; but there was still a possibility that the English Royalists might rise for their King, and the fear of this created panic in the Parliament, notwithstanding the comforting assurances of their general.

The Royalist plots of the previous year, though held

[1] Burnet's *Hamiltons*, vii. p. 24. [2] *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. p. 53.
[3] Cary's *Memorials*, ii. p. 305.

in abeyance, had not been crushed, and rumours of intended insurrection had for many months past kept the Government in a state of constant agitation. The disaffection of the Presbyterians steadily increased; many of the ministers refused to keep the thanksgiving-day appointed for the victory of Dunbar, and the Christmas Festival (1650) was 'wilfully' observed by a large proportion of the population. Yet there was, after all, little cause for alarm, since the ubiquitous spies who gained and betrayed the confidence of the Royalists kept the Government well informed of all their proceedings. Through one of these, George Bishop by name, the Council of State received warning, in January 1651, of the intended general insurrection, and was enabled to take measures to frustrate it. An order of council was at once promulgated prohibiting all public meetings for hunting, hawking, racing, or football, since such gatherings became invariably centres of disaffection. Lord Antrim and other suspected persons were arrested, a large number of arms were seized in various parts of the country, the estates of all who corresponded with the 'King of Scots' were declared forfeited, and Henry Hyde, a cousin of the Chancellor, was executed on the charge of having accepted from Charles the embassy to Constantinople. Captain Levinz—for bringing the King's commissions into the country—a lawyer named Andrews, and several other persons, suffered a like fate. In March the discovery of a letter written by Charles to the Levellers and the capture of Isaac Birkenhead, a messenger carrying despatches between Charles and Lord Derby, put the key of all plots into the hands of the Government.[1]

1651 January-March

'The great discoveries occasioned by the unhappy intercepting of Birkenhead will, I fear, be so epidemical a discouragement to all honest men in England as will make them shift for themselves and destroy all hopes there,' wrote Nicholas in April 1651.[2]

[1] Proceedings of the Council of State; *Calendar of Dom. State Papers*, January-March 1651.

[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 443.

1651 March

But worse was to follow. Among Birkenhead's papers was a letter addressed to Thomas Coke, a son of the late Secretary of State, who had been intrusted with the negotiations between the Royalist and Presbyterian parties. This letter contained information of the Scottish preparations for invading England, and led to the arrest of Coke by Harrison on the 29th of March 1651. Well might Nicholas characterise this event as 'a sad and fatal misfortune to the King.'[1] Coke, to save his life, threw himself on the mercy of the Parliament, professed repentance of his errors, and made full confession of all that he knew. He betrayed the hiding-place of several important papers, among which was a detailed account of all the Royalist schemes contained in the King's instructions delivered to him at Breda. He revealed the secret of ciphers, gave up the names of all who had sent information to the King or held intercourse with himself, and even offered to continue his correspondence with his former friends for the purpose of betraying them to the council.[2]

'That which looks to me most hideous in Coke's discovery is that, three days after his apprehension, he wrote a letter to a gallant gentleman here . . . to send him over a list of the names of the nobility and gentry in Kent,'[3] wrote Nicholas. Fortunately the 'gallant gentleman' had timely warning, and the list was not sent; but the council had learnt all that they needed to know. Country gentlemen, nobles, merchants, and ministers were involved in the general condemnation and some few escaped to Holland, where they told 'many strange and incredible stories of Mr. Coke's betraying all the King's business and all persons that in England had been faithful to the King.'[4]

In consequence of Coke's revelations, about two thousand persons were arrested, including the Duke of Richmond, Lord Beauchamp, and most of the Royalist

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 237.
[2] *Coke's Confessions*, *Hist. MSS. Com.*, Rept. 13, App. i. pp. 576-603.
[3] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 456.
[4] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 240.

leaders. A Presbyterian minister named Love, at whose house the conspirators had held meetings, suffered death. A new Confiscation Act authorised the sale of seventeen persons' estates; ecclesiastical and Crown property was also sacrificed to raise money for the national defence, and it was even proposed to pull down and sell some of the cathedrals, but this act of iconoclasm was happily prevented. 1651 March-August

The precautions hitherto taken by the Government were now redoubled. Harrison was sent to the north-west; Fleetwood was summoned to London; the militia was called out, and the most stringent instructions were issued to the commissioners controlling it. They were to enforce subscription of the Engagement to be true to the Commonwealth, to disperse meetings, investigate plots, disarm and secure all Papists and suspected Royalists, render their houses untenable, and place their horses and arms in the charge of the well affected. Parents and masters were to be held responsible for the conduct of their children and servants; death was to be the penalty of joining the Scots, and informers were to be rewarded with a third of their victims' estates. The militia rallied to the support of the Commonwealth, yet the terror of the Government was unallayed, and their asseverations of security and contempt for the Scots contrasted oddly with the panic betrayed by the tone of their orders and the severity of the measures that they saw fit to adopt—a panic that increased as the Scottish army drew nearer.[1]

Charles had warned his English friends as early as the previous April to be ready for his coming, bidding them take the signal from Lord Derby, since he was unable to fix a definite date for his march. But the Royalists, paralysed by the loss of leaders, horses, and money, hating the Scots, and disgusted by the wholesale betrayal of their secrets, which they rather unreasonably attributed to the indiscretion of the Queen, remained

[1] Proceedings of the Council of State, March-August 1651, *Calendar of Dom. State Papers. Hist. MSS.*, Rept. 13, App. i. p. 603.

1651 August

quiescent.[1] For the second time Charles's hopes were disappointed, and when, after a rapid march through Lanark and Dumfries, he reached the English border with an army reduced by desertions to little more than half its original strength, few recruits came to swell its numbers. Proclaiming a free pardon to all save regicides, he marched on to Carlisle with about nine thousand foot and four thousand horse, and, for artillery, sixteen leather guns. On the 6th of August he summoned the town to surrender, but the summons was received with silent contempt, and he did not pause to enforce it. Crossing the river Eden, he came to Rokeby, where he was proclaimed King with much flourish of trumpets, drums, and cannon; and this ceremony was repeated next day at Penrith, and again in all market-towns through which he passed.[2]

So far nothing had occurred to alter Hamilton's opinion of the desperate character of the expedition, and on August 8th he wrote with ill-concealed despondency to his friend William Crofts in Paris.

'The last thing I did was to drink your health with Lord Thomas, Dan O'Neil, and Lauderdale, who are now laughing at the ridiculousness of our condition. We have quit Scotland, being scarce able to maintain it; and yet we grasp at all. . . . I confess I cannot tell you whether our hopes or fears are greatest, but we have one stout argument—despair; for we must either stoutly fight or die.'[3]

On the following day, August 9th, the army met, for the first time, with some slight opposition at Appleby, where a few troops of Harrison's horse disputed its advance. The skirmish was insignificant, and the English were forced back without difficulty; but the prospect did not improve as the Scots marched southwards. Though the strictest discipline was maintained,

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 414, 417.
[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 560-2. *Sir J. Turner*, p. 94. *Lyon*, p. 207.
[3] Cary's *Memorials*, ii. p. 305.

all plundering being sternly prohibited and severely punished, the confidence of the country was not gained. Some degree of interest and sympathy the people displayed, but no enthusiasm; and, even in Lancashire, where the Catholic and Presbyterian interests were strong, recruits were few and far between, nor was it easy to find arms for those few.[1]

Buckingham saw in the general indifference only the national dislike of the Scots, and took occasion to point out to the King the 'unreasonableness' of allowing Leslie to retain command of the army, since the English gentry could not be expected to serve under him. Charles asked, in surprise, whom he could possibly put in Leslie's place, and received the astonishing reply that Buckingham himself was willing to assume the office of Commander-in-Chief. Words failed the King, and he broke off the conversation by turning abruptly to some one else. But Buckingham was not so easily repulsed, and, on the next day's march, he 'renewed his importunities,' alleging that the proposed change of generals was 'so evidently for the King's service that David Leslie himself would willingly consent to it.' Irritated by this persistence, Charles remarked that his friend was doubtless jesting, since he could not possibly propose so absurd a thing in earnest; but the Duke, quite unabashed, merely inquired wherein the absurdity lay. The King told him curtly that he was too young for such a responsibility; he promptly responded that Henri IV. of France had won a battle at an earlier age, and Charles, driven to desperation, closed the discussion by stating wrathfully that he was himself Commander-in-Chief, and intended to appoint no other. Buckingham might have retorted with a *tu quoque*, since Charles was his junior, but he merely sulked, 'came no more to council, scarce spoke to the King, and neglected everybody else and himself insomuch as for many days he never put on clean linen nor conversed with anybody.'[2]

[1] Cary's *Memorials*, ii. p. 310. [2] *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. p. 72.

On August 13th Lambert, who had followed all the way a day's march behind the Scots, effected a junction with Harrison, and the two, assisted by the militia of Staffordshire and Cheshire, attempted to defend the passage of the Mersey at Warrington. In the skirmish that ensued the Royalists had the advantage; Lambert and Harrison fell back to Congleton, keeping the road to London with nine thousand horse, and the Royalists, having mended the broken bridge with planks, gained the Cheshire side of the river, the King himself being the first man to cross.

The next day, August 17th, the Earl of Derby joined the army at Stoke with a small force of two hundred and fifty foot and a body of sixty horse—mostly gentlemen, his own friends or dependants. A council of war was held, at which Hamilton, true to his opinion that desperate boldness was the only way out of their difficulties, urged a direct march on London.[1] Charles lacked neither courage nor enterprise, and might have entertained the proposal, but Leslie, depressed and pessimistic, opposed it. Throughout the march he had been 'sad and melancholic,' riding often silent and alone, and now, when Charles sought to cheer him by praising the 'brave' aspect of the army, he only replied grimly that 'that army, how well soever it *looked*, would not fight.'[2] Charles disbelieved this, attributing the speech to 'the chagrin of his (Leslie's) humour,' but he suffered prudent counsel to prevail, and decided to march by the Welsh border, where the country was always loyal and recruits might be reasonably hoped for. Derby and Massey were to return to Lancashire and rouse the county on the King's behalf, calling to arms all the male population between the ages of sixteen and sixty. Much was expected of this mission, for Derby's power in Lancashire was great, and Massey had many friends and considerable influence among the Presbyterians of that county. It was his part to persuade his co-religionists

[1] Burnet's *Hamiltons*, vii. p. 26. [2] *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. p. 62.

to join with Derby's Catholic Cavaliers; 'but,' says Clarendon, 'it was fatal to all Scottish armies to have always in them a committee of ministers who ruined all,' and the present occasion was no exception to the rule. During the march through England the distrust of the Scottish ministers had been aroused by the King's frequent visits to the houses of his Roman Catholic subjects, and, when Massey was sent on in advance, he was charged with a letter from the Presbytery of the army to the Presbytery of Lancashire, protesting the Scottish zeal for the Covenant, and exhorting their English brethren to make no alliance with 'Malignants.' Not until the day after Derby's departure did Charles discover the existence of this letter. Then he wrote at once, bidding Massey burn it and disregard its precepts. Massey obeyed, but the mischief was done. The Presbyterian gentry and clergy who came to meet Derby at Warrington required him to take the Covenant and renounce his 'Papist' comrades. Argument availed nothing, and Derby at last broke up the conference, saying: 'If I perish, I perish; but if my master perish, the blood of another Prince and all the ensuing miseries of this kingdom will be at your doors.' Massey, finding his errand fruitless, rejoined the King at Stoke, and Derby, like the gallant gentleman he was, resolved to do alone all that lay in his power, though he did not love the Scots and had small hope for the success of the cause.

At a council of war held at Warrington on August 19th, it was decided to raise forces in the county notwithstanding the recalcitrance of the Presbyterian party, but to do this time was required, and Cromwell was already close at hand. On August 22nd Derby was attacked by Robert Lilburne, whom Lambert and Harrison had left to hold Lancashire in check. For three days the hostile parties skirmished without coming to any definite issue; but at last, on August 25th, Lilburne, reinforced by one of Cromwell's regiments, was able to bring matters to a crisis. He met Derby—now at the head of 1500 men—

near Wigan, and a sharp encounter took place. Derby's men fought bravely, but, raw recruits as they were, they had no chance against the disciplined and seasoned troopers of Cromwell. The engagement resulted in a complete victory for Lilburne; four hundred prisoners were taken, and many Royalists—among them Lord Widdrington and other gentlemen of distinction—fell on the field. Derby himself escaped, wounded, and was succoured and sheltered by the Penderels of Boscobel, who enabled him to join the King, some days later, at Worcester.[1]

Charles himself had met with little better success. Sir Thomas Middleton of Chirk Castle,[2] a Presbyterian on whom he had depended for the rousing of North Wales, refused to hold communication with him, arrested his messenger, and sent his letter to the Council of State. And Colonel Mackworth, Governor of Shrewsbury, not only refused to obey the royal summons to surrender the town, but addressed his refusal to 'the Commander-in-Chief of the Scottish army'—a hit which expressed more clearly than many words the English attitude towards the King who had brought foreign invaders into the land.

At Worcester, which he reached on August 22nd, Charles was at last received with real enthusiasm. A party of five hundred horse, sent by Lambert to hold the town, was driven across the Severn, leaving behind the Earl of Shrewsbury and other prisoners of note, and the citizens, headed by the Mayor, came out to welcome the King. Encouraged by this friendly reception, Charles yielded to the entreaties of his weary soldiers, and called a halt in 'the faithful city.' The army, utterly spent by its march of three-and-twenty days, imperatively needed rest and refreshment. Moreover, it was now manifestly impossible to reach London before Cromwell, for he, having taken a more direct route, from Newcastle through

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. pp. 58-61, 66-8. Blount's *Boscobel*, pp. 173-5. Gardiner's *Commonwealth*, i. pp. 435-7.

[2] Not to be confounded with the Scottish Lieutenant-General of that name.

Yorkshire, Nottingham, Leicester, and Warwickshire, was already between the Scots and the capital. There was no choice but to await his attack, and Worcester seemed as good a place as any for the purpose. The inhabitants were loyal, the country fertile, the Severn formed a natural defence to the south-west of the city, and, though the fortifications had been destroyed in the first Civil War, there would be time to throw up earthworks before Cromwell could arrive. Also Wales lay close behind, whence recruits might yet be drawn, and whither, in the worst event, retreat might be made.

In the interval Charles did what he could to arm and clothe his men, for whom shoes and stockings were generously provided by the Mayor, and to win the support of the neighbouring counties. On the 23rd, the day after his arrival in the city, he summoned all persons between the ages of sixteen and sixty to assemble in Pitchcroft Meadows, outside the town, for the defence of King and country, and appointed the 26th as the day of rendezvous. On that day he issued a second manifesto, promising to settle religion according to the Covenant, to grant a general pardon to all save the regicides, to pay the arrears of soldiers deserting the Commonwealth, and to dismiss the Scots as soon as the enemy had been defeated. He also took occasion to point out the orderly conduct of his army, and the general abstinence from plundering and acts of violence. But neither proclamation had any effect, and those who appeared at the rendezvous were miserably few, though they counted among their numbers Lord Talbot, with about sixty horse, and several other country gentlemen. It was evident that Charles must fight his battle with the forces that he had brought from Scotland. Accordingly, he garrisoned the city, began to repair the fort on the south-east side of the walls, broke the bridge over the Severn at Upton, leaving Massey to guard the place, put Montgomery with a considerable force to hold Powick Bridge on the Teme, and massed his main army in the triangle

formed by the junction of the Teme and the Severn, south-west of Worcester.

The critical moment was close at hand. On August 24th Cromwell joined Lambert, Harrison, and Fleetwood at Warwick, and, with a force of 28,000 men, took up his quarters at Evesham. Possessed of overwhelming numbers, he could now divide his army without fear, and, remaining himself to hold the London road, he bade Lambert and Fleetwood cross the Severn and cut the Scots off from the west. On the 28th, in consequence of Massey's neglect to post a sentinel, Lambert contrived to cross the broken bridge at Upton by a plank left for foot-passengers. The Royalists, thus surprised, resisted fiercely, but in vain, and Massey, severely wounded, was forced to retreat to Worcester with his three hundred men. Lambert then mended the bridge, set Fleetwood to guard it, and successfully passed over it eleven thousand men. The first of Charles's river defences was gone, but it still remained to cross the Teme, for which purpose it was necessary to construct a bridge of boats. While this work was being done, Cromwell appeared at Perrywood, a mile south-east of Worcester, with a large body of horse and foot. Charles thought to surprise him, and, on the night of the 29th, Middleton sallied out with twelve hundred men, all wearing their shirts over their armour, for the better distinction of friend from foe. But the attack failed, owing to treachery within; Middleton was repulsed with loss, and Cromwell maintained his position, whence his guns played continually on the town and fort. On the day following, Fleetwood halted at Powick, on the opposite bank of the Teme from that held by Montgomery. Day by day the besiegers drew a closer ring round the besieged; the country was Cromwell's, everywhere the local forces had rallied to his support, and the adhesion of the militia had raised his army to thirty-one thousand men, nearly three times the number of that of Charles, who had now about ten thousand Scots and two thousand English.

To such an unequal struggle there could be but one issue, and the despondency of the Royalists was extreme. Massey openly expressed a wish that his King were 'safe in some foreign part.' Leslie waxed more irritable than ever, 'appeared utterly dispirited and confounded,' and continually revoked or contradicted his own orders. His jealousy of Middleton's popularity and the general want of unanimity common to Royalist armies enhanced the misery of the situation, nor was the arrival of the wounded Derby on the 31st, with a detailed account of the Wigan disaster, calculated to relieve the tension. 1651 September 3rd-13th

Yet Charles, who had been throughout the life of the expedition, ever cheerful and unwearied, refused to despair. On the night of September 2nd-12th, having received information that a strong party of the enemy had gone to Bewdly and another to Upton, he resolved to attack while the hostile forces were divided, and early on the morning of the 3rd of September he called a council of war on the top of the cathedral tower, whence the surrounding country could be best observed. It was then decided to divide the army into three parts, two to attack Cromwell simultaneously on different sides of Perrywood, the third to be kept in reserve for emergencies. Before this could be done, Cromwell had detached a column, a thousand strong, to make a bridge over the Severn about a mile below the city, and Fleetwood opened an attack on Montgomery. Leaving orders to draw up the army for battle, Charles hastened to the scene of action, and, almost immediately, Cromwell began to fire on the fort. The battle had now become general. Charles reinforced Montgomery with two thousand men, sent Colonel Pittscottie with three hundred Highlanders to oppose the column on the Severn, and galloped back to the main army. Montgomery held the passage of the Teme until his ammunition was spent, when he was forced to give way in some disorder, and Pittscottie's Highlanders were also swept back, after a gallant

struggle against terrible odds. It was then easy for the enemy to complete their bridges, and, about three o'clock in the afternoon, Fleetwood, aided by Cromwell in person, began to bring his regiments across the river. The Scots, posted behind the hedges, still offered resistance, falling back slowly to Worcester, and fighting every inch of the way.

Charles himself had not been idle. Placing himself at the head of a force composed of his own and Hamilton's regiments, some English Cavaliers, and a few Highlanders, and accompanied by Buckingham, Hamilton, and Grandison, he charged Cromwell's army on the south-east with such vigour that it gave way before him. But his success was short-lived. Cromwell, perceiving the peril of his men, hurried back with reinforcements, and, though the Royalists fought hard, using the butt-ends of their muskets when ammunition failed, they could not stand before the reserves poured in upon them. Hamilton, Sir John Douglas, and Sir Alexander Forbes fell, mortally wounded; Leslie, who had remained behind with three thousand Scottish horse, did not come to the King's assistance, and the Royalists, overwhelmed by numbers and disheartened by the loss of their leaders, broke at last, and were forced back to the town walls, hotly pursued by the enemy.

An overturned ammunition waggon obstructed the entrance at Sudbury gate, but Charles, dismounting, climbed through the wheels, and, having thrown off his armour and procured a fresh horse, he rode about the streets addressing men and officers by name, and imploring Leslie's cavalry to fight for very shame. But all was vain. Middleton was wounded, and Leslie 'rode up and down as one amazed,' until Charles cried out in fierce despair: 'I had rather you would shoot me than keep me alive to see the consequences of this fatal day!'

The reason of Leslie's conduct is obscure. Charles accused him subsequently of treachery or cowardice, but the old general was neither coward nor traitor. He was

most likely actuated by the conviction that his men would not fight, a conviction that he had cherished from the outset; founded probably on his memories of Dunbar. A born leader of men, like Cromwell or Montrose, would have fired his troops with his own zeal and courage, making them enthusiasts in spite of themselves. But Leslie, though a skilful strategist, lacked the personal qualities that make a popular general, and his want of confidence in his troops reacted on the men, destroying their confidence in themselves. But, be the cause of their inaction what it may, the result was disaster and ignominious flight.

Cromwell captured the fort, put all its defenders to the sword, and turned its guns on the Scots. About six o'clock in the evening the gates were forced; the enemy poured into the city, west and east at once, and a terrible slaughter ensued. Lord Rothes and Sir William Hamilton held the Castle Hill until conditions of surrender were offered to them. Another party maintained the town-hall for a while, and Cleveland, with Colonel Wogan, Colonel Carlos, and several other English officers, rallying a small body of horse, disputed the streets till midnight, covering the King's retreat and filling the town with 'dead bodies of horses and men.' Finally, Carlos and Wogan alone, with fifty horse, broke through the hostile ranks and made their escape. The Scottish foot were annihilated, the few survivors laid down their arms, and the Scottish horse fled in wild confusion through St. Martin's gate.[1] 'Towards evening,' says one of their number, 'all things appeared very horrid, alarms being in every part of the city, and a report that the enemy had entered one end of the town, and we of the horse trampling one upon another, and much readier to cut each other's throats than to defend ourselves against the enemy. In this confusion we at last got out of the town

[1] *Boscobel Tracts*, pp. 27-36, 124-8, 175-88. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., xvi. fol. 40. *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 561-3. *Echard*, ii. p. 711. Bates's *Elenchus Motuum*, p. 126.

and fled as fast as we could, our two lieutenant-generals being, as it appeared next morning, at our head.'[1]

With the fugitives went the King, having, as he asserted, narrowly escaped capture in his own lodgings, whither he had gone, probably, to rescue some possession he valued. He at least had fought with unfailing valour. 'Certainly,' wrote one of his officers, 'a braver prince never lived, having in the day of the fight hazarded his person much more than any officer of his army, riding from regiment to regiment, and leading them on upon service with all the encouragement that the example and exhortation of a magnanimous general could afford.'[2]

'God preserve him!' exclaimed another Royalist, 'for certainly a more gallant prince was never born.'

Half a mile from Worcester, Charles was seized with shame for his flight, and, drawing rein, proposed to rally the Scottish horse for a final charge, when, if they could not turn the fortune of the day, they might at least fall with honour on the field. Buckingham and Wilmot speedily convinced him of the impossibility of getting the flying Scots to face the victorious foe, and, yielding to their representations, he slipped aside from the cavalry, because, he said, 'Men who had deserted me when they were in good order would never stand to me when they have been beaten,' and, with a small band of his English friends, took another route northward.[3]

In this he was fortunate, for few of the fugitive horse were destined to reach Scotland. 'We had no guide,' says one of the survivors, 'so often lost our way, but yet reached Newport, thirty miles this side of Worcester, the next morning, and there thought to have refreshed ourselves and marched quietly for Scotland. But our enemies' posts flew faster than we, and there wanted not considerable forces in every place to front us, and we were so closely pursued in the day by the army and garrison forces and in the night by the country, that from

[1] *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., xvi. fol. 40.
[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. p. 562.
[3] *Boscobel*, p. 134.

the time we came out of Worcester till the Friday evening that I was taken prisoner, seven miles from Preston, neither I nor my horse ever rested. Our body consisted of three thousand. In the day we often faced the enemy, and beat their little parties, but still those of us whose horses tired or were shot were lost, unless they could run as fast as we rode. In the night we kept close together, yet still some fell asleep on their horses, and if their horses tarried behind, we might hear by their cries what the bloody country-people were doing with them. On Thursday night, Lieutenant-Generals Middleton and Leslie left us, or willingly lost us, but, with all the haste they made, both of them, with Sir William Fleming, are here prisoners. I left Duke Hamilton a prisoner at my coming out of Worcester, having been shot in the leg, and he is since dead, through the cutting of it off. Few, or none, of the King's servants have escaped.'[1] 1651 September

Small indeed was the number of Royalists who escaped with life and limb, yet some fell into kind hands. Buckingham was succoured and disguised by farm-labourers, and, after many adventures, gained the Continent safely. Sir James Turner was rescued by bargees, who guided him to London, carrying him in turns when he could no longer walk, and who refused any other reward for their services than half-a-crown wherewith to drink his health. A shoemaker and barber showed the same generosity, asking only the ribbons from Sir James's coat in return for their services, and three Londoners, strangers to himself, provided him with clothes and with the means of reaching Holland. Hugh May, one of Charles's household, was concealed three weeks in a haystack by a farmer, who had, all the time, Commonwealth soldiers quartered in his house. Lord Talbot was aided by an old servant, who hid him in an outhouse, where he was 'almost stifled for want of air,' and nearly died of starvation, since the place was so closely watched that he could only be visited at long intervals.

[1] *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., vi. fol. 40.

1651 September-October

The English fared better than the Scots, because they knew the country better, and because many who would do nothing for a foreign invader were loth to leave a fellow-countryman to perish. But the majority of both nations were made prisoners, many were murdered by peasants, and some wandered about the country until they died of hunger, fatigue, and exposure.[1]

Derby was taken by Lilburne's men, and died with courage and dignity upon the scaffold. 'I was born with honour, have lived with honour, and hope I shall die with honour,' he said in his last speech. 'I had a fair estate, and I needed not to mend that. I had good friends, by whom I was respected, and I respected them. They were ready to do for me, and I was ready to do for them. . . . It was the King who called me, and I thought I was bound in duty to wait upon him to do him service.'

To his son, who was suffered to be with him to the end, he gave the insignia of the garter, bidding him return it to his Sovereign when the opportunity arose. 'And say I sent it, in all humility and gratitude,' bade the dying man, 'as I received it, spotless and free from any stain, according to the example of my loyal ancestors.'[2]

On the same day, two of his officers, Captain Benbow and Sir Timothy Fetherstonhaugh, paid for their loyalty with their lives. Other officers suffered the same penalty in different parts of the country. Hamilton was saved from the scaffold by a timely death, and the Mayor of Worcester had the same good fortune. Cleveland was taken at Woodcote two days after the battle, and was confined in the Tower. Massey, sorely wounded, surrendered himself to Lady Stamford, and was by her given up to the Parliament. Middleton and Leslie were captured near Rochdale; Lauderdale was taken by Lilburne, and all were imprisoned in the Tower. Thence Middleton and Massey, in due time, escaped. The others

[1] Sir J. Turner's *Memoirs*, pp. 96-9. Hughes's *Boscobel*, pp. 196, 197. Bates's *Elenchus Motuum*, Pt. II. pp. 129-30.

[2] *Mercurius Politicus*, 15th October 1651.

remained there 'divers years,' and Lauderdale and Leslie were still prisoners at the Restoration. 1651 August-December

Of the common soldiers, most of the English were sent to serve in Ireland. The Scots fared worse. A large number were sold to work in New England, but it is doubtful whether their transportation was ever really effected. An attempt to sell others as slaves on the coast of New Guinea failed for lack of purchasers. Some were compelled to work at the drainage of the Lincolnshire fens; numbers died of disease, due to overcrowded prisons and insufficient food; and, in December 1652, the few survivors were permitted to return to their native land.

The fear of a Scottish invasion was passed. There was no longer a Scottish army, no longer, politically speaking, any Scotland.

Stirling was taken by Monk on August 14th, and on August the 28th the old Earl of Leven and the whole Committee of Estates fell into his hands. On September the 1st he stormed Dundee and massacred all within the town, regardless of age or sex, much as Cromwell had done at Drogheda and Wexford. Huntly submitted in November. Argyle fawned on the conquerors. Loudoun lived 'like ane outlaw,' and most of the Scottish barons were dead or dispossessed. Lowland Scotland was subjugated more completely than Ireland had been, and only the inaccessible Highlands still defied the English conquest.

In England the effects of the victory at Worcester were no less satisfactory than in Scotland. The Royalists were depressed for years to come, and the necessity of defending itself against a foreign invasion had united the nation and consolidated the Commonwealth as nothing else could have done.

Cromwell had rightly exclaimed, on the day after the battle: 'The dimensions of this mercy are above my thoughts. It is, for aught I know, a crowning mercy.'[1]

[1] *Cal. Dom. State Papers*, Jan.-Nov. 1652, pp. 13, 16, 17, 38, 44, 130, 515. Hughes's *Boscobel*, pp. 193-8. *Social England*, iv. p. 331. Gardiner's *Commonwealth*, i. pp. 460-70.

CHAPTER X[1]

Efforts of the English Government to capture the King—The Flight from Worcester—Whiteladies—Charles desires to go to London—Decides to cross the Severn—Goes to Madeley—Returns to Boscobel—The Royal Oak—The Adventures of Wilmot—Charles at Moseley—At Bentley Hall—The Journey to Bristol—Abbotsleigh—Trent—Flight of Jane Lane to France.

1651 September-October

THE one thing wanting to complete the triumph of the Commonwealth party was the capture of the King, and it did not seem that this could be long delayed. Charles's retreat had been cut off on every side. The roads were held, north and south, by Cromwell's troops; the bridges of the Severn were secured; the ports were closely watched, and the Government believed that within a few days at furthest their enemy must inevitably fall into their hands. But the days passed; thousands of prisoners were taken, fugitives were hunted down in all directions, and in the long lists of the captured the name of Charles Stuart was not found.

The Council of State became uneasy and issued orders for the arrest of all strangers, warned the guardians of the ports to redouble their vigilance, and proclaimed all who should shelter or succour Charles Stuart traitors, liable to the death penalty. A reward of £1000 was offered for the King's apprehension, and, 'for the better discovery of him,' an official description of his person was published. 'Take notice of him to be a tall man,

[1] Four of the Tracts here quoted, viz. the Accounts given by the King, Whitgreave, Mrs. Wyndham, and Blount, are printed verbatim in Hughes's *Boscobel*, and have been recently republished by Mr. Fea in his *After Worcester Fight*. The other five narratives, which were originally printed separately, are collected in Mr. Fea's *Flight of the King*.

CHARLES II.

From the engraving by H. Danckers in the British Museum, after Adrian Hanneman.

above two yards high,' it ran, 'his hair a deep brown, near to black, and has been, as we hear, cut off since the destruction of his army at Worcester, so that it is not very long.'[1]

But neither threat nor bribe produced the expected result. The King had disappeared, leaving no trace behind him, and a report that he had lain unrecognised among the dead at Worcester gradually gained credence. From this comforting belief the English Parliament was abruptly startled in the end of October by the news of Charles's safe arrival in France.

His escape appeared to himself to be little short of miraculous, and might well astonish friend and foe alike. He owed it primarily to that devoted loyalty to the Sovereign's person which, traditional in England since the Tudors reigned, had become a passion under the Stuarts, and which the Stuarts themselves could not wholly destroy. The English rising had missed fire, the Scottish invasion had failed, but loyalty still lived, and the King, helpless and defeated, was more sacred to his faithful subjects than he could have been in the hour of success and victory. On his side, too, was the generous instinct that prompts the average Englishman to shield a fugitive, and to prefer the cause of the hunted to that of the hunter. It says much for human nature that none of the many to whom Charles was made known during his six weeks' wanderings betrayed his trust, and even the poorest of them, to whom the sum of £1000 meant a great fortune, chose rather to risk their lives than to profit by treachery. There is also much credit due to Charles himself, for, without his cool courage, ready wit, and unfailing good-humour in difficulty and danger, all the devotion lavished upon him could not have availed to save him. Indeed at Worcester, where he displayed a gallantry that would not have shamed his cousin Rupert, and during his flight through England, his character shows to an advan-

[1] *Cal. Dom. State Papers*, 14th October 1651. Council of State to Officers of Customs.

1651 September 3rd-13th

tage which is in curious contrast with his previous conduct in Scotland. Had he eventually perished on the scaffold, and could the Scottish episode have been blotted out, posterity would have cherished his memory as that of a prince altogether admirable. It should, at least, be remembered in his favour that he never forgot those who, in the days of his peril, risked their lives for his, and that, when fortune turned, he did what lay in his power to give them substantial proof of his gratitude.

Charles's first impulse, on realising that all was lost, had been to make straight for London, arriving there, if possible, before the news of his defeat. But, with the exception of Wilmot, his English companions discouraged the idea, though many doubted the possibility of gaining Scotland, and all agreed in the desire to detach themselves from the stampeding Scottish cavalry. This proved no easy task.

'Though I could not get them to stand by me against the enemy, I could not get rid of them now I had a mind to it,' says Charles.[1] But at nightfall he contrived to turn out of the high-road and take his way to the right, with about sixty gentlemen and officers, among whom were Derby, Buckingham, Wilmot, Talbot, Lauderdale, Edward Roscarrock, and Charles Giffard. Being now uncertain of the route, they appealed to Lord Talbot, as a native of the county, to direct them northwards. To this he proved unequal, but a soldier of his troop undertook the guidance of the company and lead them as far as Kinver Heath, near Kidderminster. There, confused by the darkness, he halted abruptly, saying that he could do no more. Charles turned to Derby for counsel, and the faithful earl, mindful of his recent flight from Wigan, advised him to seek Boscobel House, where there was to be found 'a perfect, honest man and a great convenience of concealment.'[2] This advice pleased Charles, and Lord Talbot, being informed of his intentions, called

[1] King's Account, Hughes's *Boscobel*, p. 132 (edition 1830).
[2] Blount's *Boscobel*, p. 189.

up Charles Giffard, to whose family Boscobel belonged, and bade him lead the way thither. Giffard, in his turn, proposed to go first to Whiteladies, another seat of his family, about twenty-six miles from Worcester and a little nearer than Boscobel. This was agreed on, and he undertook to find the way there, with the assistance of his servant, Francis Yates. Some little hesitation was felt about passing through Stourbridge, where a troop of the enemy's horse was quartered, but it was decided to take the risk, and all agreed to speak French 'to prevent any discovery of his Majesty's presence,' a curious precaution as it seems, since the foreign language must have stamped them unmistakably Cavaliers.[1] However, riding very quietly through the town at midnight, they escaped notice, and were able to halt at a house two miles beyond it, where a drink and a little bread and meat was obtained. With bread in one hand and meat in the other, Charles rode on, conversing about Boscobel with Roscarrock, who had shared Derby's former adventures. Just at daybreak they reached the old Cistercian convent, Whiteladies, on the borders of Brewood Forest.[2]

1651 September 4th-14th

The demesnes of both Whiteladies and Boscobel belonged at that period to a Mrs. Cotton, who had inherited them from her father, John Giffard, but she herself occupied neither house, and Whiteladies was let out in 'apartments' to several different families. Besides two families of Giffards, there dwelt there a Mrs. Anne Andrews; an old priest, named Walker; a certain Edward Martin, with his wife and three sons; and John and George Penderel.

The father of the Penderels, who were destined to play an important part in the King's escape, had been steward to the Giffards, and his five surviving sons still lived on the estate. William, the eldest, dwelt at Boscobel House, with his wife and children; Richard, with his mother at Hobbal Grange; Humphrey at the Mill

[1] Blount's *Boscobel*, p. 189.

[2] Fea, *Flight of the King*, p. 16.

of Whiteladies; and John and George in the big house itself. All lived the same kind of life, 'having little farms there, and labouring for their living in cutting down of wood and watching of the wood from being stolen,' and all, like the Giffards themselves, were devout members of the Roman Church.[1]

It was George Penderel who was first roused from sleep at three o'clock on the morning of Thursday, September 4th, by loud knocking at the gate. On coming to the window, he saw Francis Yates, his brother-in-law, standing below, and, without staying to dress himself, he hurried down to open the gates.

'What news from Worcester?' was his first question.

'The King is defeated and is here,' responded Yates.

And as he spoke, King and lords flocked into the hall, bringing Charles's horse with them. The household was speedily aroused, and Mrs. Giffard hastened to lay before the hungry travellers bread, cheese, and sack, wherewith they gladly regaled themselves. Derby, meanwhile, despatched one of the young Martins to summon William Penderel from Boscobel, and Giffard, at the same time, sent for Richard, who lived close by.

Richard, on his arrival, was immediately sent back again to get a suit of clothes for the King, whose hair Wilmot now proceeded to chop off with a knife. Charles next rubbed his face and hands with soot taken from the chimney, divested himself of his ornaments, confiding his watch to Wilmot and his diamond George to Colonel Blague, and distributed all the gold he carried among his servants. By this time Richard had returned, and Charles quickly assumed the garments provided for him. These were 'a coarse noggen shirt,' borrowed of Edward Martin, 'a jump and breeches of green coarse cloth, and a doeskin, leather doublet,' belonging to either William or Richard Penderel, and all very much the worse for wear, grey stockings, much darned about the knees,

[1] Fea, *Flight of the King*, pp. 22, 23. Hughes, *King's Account*, p. 3, note.

pair of patched shoes, lent by a certain William Cresswell, which had to be cut and slashed before Charles could wear them with any comfort, and 'a long, white, steeple-crowned hat, without any other lining than grease, both sides of the brim so doubled with handling that they looked like two spouts.' This last choice article of apparel was furnished by Humphrey Penderel, the miller. Finally, Richard completed the disguise by trimming Charles's hair, which Wilmot had 'untowardly notched.' With a pair of shears he cut it very short on the top, leaving it long about the ears, according to the country fashion. 'And the King was pleased to take notice of Richard's good barbering, so as to prefer his work before my Lord Wilmot's, and gave him praise of it.'[1]

William Penderel then arrived from Boscobel, and was led in by Lord Derby, who pointed to Charles, saying: 'This is the King. Thou must have a care of him and preserve him as thou didst me.'[2]

Giffard delivered a similar charge to Richard, and both brothers promised to do whatever lay in their power. But safety for more than one person they could not guarantee, and the only service that Charles's loyal followers could now render him was to take their departure, lest their presence should increase his danger. Begging him 'with one voice' to let them remain ignorant of his future plans, 'because they knew not what they might be forced to confess,' they, one by one, 'took their heavy leave and departed, every one shifting for himself.' Only to Wilmot, who had from the first approved the idea of going to London, did Charles confide that his intentions were unchanged, and the two agreed to meet at the Three Cranes, by the Vintry, in Thomas Street.[3]

[1] Fea, *Flight of the King*, pp. 202-4, 229. *Harleian Miscellany*, iv. p. 442. *Boscobel*, pp. 190-2.

[2] Hughes's *Tracts*, Blount's *Boscobel*, p. 191.

[3] Hughes's *Tracts*, King's Account, p. 134. Fea, Tract i. p. 204. Tract iii. p. 240. Bates's *Elenchus Motuum*, Pt. II. p. 129.

The rest being gone, Richard Penderel led the King out by a back door and conducted him to a part of the neighbouring woods, known as 'Spring Coppice,' about half a mile distant from Whiteladies. Charles, having been provided with a bill-hook, 'that he might seem busie in mending hedges,'[1] remained near the edge of the wood, the better to observe the course of events; while William, George, and Humphrey hovered on the outskirts, ready to warn him of the approach of danger. It was not long before he saw a troop of horse pass by—militia, as he judged, 'for the fellow before it did not look at all like a soldier'; and he was presently informed by his scouts that the same troop had ridden into the village, asking whether the King had not passed through. Being answered in the affirmative, they had hastened onward, showing no desire to search the place.[2]

There was no further alarm, and, throughout the day, Charles enjoyed a freedom from molestation which he attributed to the badness of the weather, for the rain poured down incessantly in the copse, though elsewhere it only fell at intervals. But if the rain afforded him protection, it also caused him keen discomfort. Not even the thickest trees could keep it off, and at last Richard, observing his charge to be soaked through, bethought him of borrowing a blanket from his sister, Elizabeth Yates, which he folded up for the King to sit on. The same good woman presently came out herself with 'a mess of milk, eggs, and sugar in a black earthen cup.'

Charles, not knowing who she might be, and a little startled at the sight of her, 'because of the babbling the sex is subject to,' asked hastily: 'Can you be true to one that hath served the King?' And received the ready response: 'Yes, sir, I 'll die sooner than betray you.' Completely reassured, he thankfully accepted the food she offered, and, having eaten some of it, handed the

[1] Fea, Tract iii. p. 241. Bates's *Elenchus Motuum*, Pt. II. p. 131.

[2] Fea, Tract i. p. 207. *Harleian Miscellany*, iv. pp. 442-3. *King's Account*, Hughes, p. 136.

rest to George, bidding him eat in his turn, 'for it was very good.'[1]

The rest of the day passed in conversation with the Penderels, who endeavoured to teach the King the speech of the district and to get him to exchange his naturally graceful carriage for the awkward gait of a country yokel. 'They had much ado all that day to teach and fashion his Majesty to their country guise, and to order his steps and straight body to a lobbing Jobson's gait,' says one chronicler; 'for the language, his Majesty's most gracious converse with his people in his journey and at Worcester had rendered it very easy and tunable to him.'[2]

Towards five o'clock in the evening it was deemed safe to seek the shelter of a roof, and Charles was escorted by three Penderels and Francis Yates to Hobbal Grange, where he was to pass as 'Will Jones, a wood-cutter, newly come thither for work.' Seated by a warm fire, with little Nan Penderel on his knee, he watched his hostess frying eggs and bacon of which he afterwards made his supper, not forgetting to invite his host to share the meal. But rest and comfort were not yet for him, and, having put some additional touches to his disguise, and conversed graciously with the old mother of the Penderels, who 'blessed God that had so honoured her children, in making them the instruments of his Majesty's safeguard,' he began to think of again setting out on his travels.[3]

His meditations in the wood, and the opinions expressed by Richard, had caused him to abandon the plan of going to London, and he was now resolved to cross the Severn into Wales, 'as being a way that I thought none would suspect my taking; besides that I remembered several honest gentlemen that were of my acquaintance in Wales.' It was decided, therefore, to go

[1] Fea, Tract iii. pp. 207, 241. Bates's *Elenchus Motuum*, Pt. II. p. 131.
[2] Fea, *Flight of the King*, Tract i. p. 208. *Boscobel Tracts*, p. 199.
[3] Fea, pp. 208-9. *Harleian Miscellany*, iv. p. 443.

that night to Madeley, a village not far from the banks of the Severn, where dwelt a certain Mr. Wolfe, who had in his house 'hiding-holes for priests,' and who would, as the Penderels thought, shelter the King and obtain for him a passage over the river.

Accepting from Francis Yates the gift of ten shillings out of thirty that he offered, and refusing all escort save that of Richard, Charles started out on foot at nine o'clock at night.[1] The distance to be traversed was some seven or eight miles, and the walk was not without adventure. As they passed by Evelith Mill, about three miles from Hobbal Grange, they caught sight of a white-clad figure in the doorway, and a challenge came through the darkness: 'Who goes there?'

'Neighbours going home!' responded Richard.

'If you be neighbours, stand!' cried the miller.

But instead of standing Richard took to his heels and Charles followed as best he could up a narrow lane. On that the miller shouted 'Rogues! Rogues!' and a party of men came out of the mill, whom the fugitives took for soldiers. 'So we fell a-running,' says Charles, 'both of us up the lane, as long as we could run, it being very steep and very dirty, till at last I bade him (Richard) leap over a hedge and lie still to hear if anybody followed us.' They then discovered that they were not pursued, and indeed the miller had been as frightened as they, and was only too glad to be rid of them. For, as it happened, he had Royalist soldiers hidden in the mill, and had mistaken the King and his companion for Commonwealth men in search of them.[2]

They reached Madeley about midnight, and Charles, doubting whether Mr. Wolfe would receive 'so dangerous a guest,' sat down in a field beneath a great tree, while Richard went on to knock up the Wolfe family. They were, of course, in bed, but the door was

[1] *Boscobel Tracts*, King's Account, p. 137. Fea, Tract i. p. 209.

[2] King's Account, Hughes's *Boscobel*, pp. 137-8. Fea, Tract i. p. 209. *Harleian Miscellany*, iv. p. 443.

1651 September 5th-15th

presently opened by the daughter of the house, who led Richard in to her father. The old man was in deep anxiety for his son, who had been made prisoner, and his reception was not encouraging. In reply to Richard's request that he would succour 'a person of quality,' he said that, 'for his part, it was so dangerous a thing to harbour anybody that was known, that he would not venture his neck for any man unless it were the King himself.' Richard was thus forced to reveal the identity of his friend, whereupon Mr. Wolfe's manner changed, and he declared himself 'very ready to venture all that he had in the world.' Charles was then brought in at the back door, and was greeted by his host with the chilling remark that he was 'very sorry to see him.' There were, the old man proceeded to explain, two companies of militia quartered in the village which kept a strict watch on the ferry, examined all persons who passed to and fro, constantly visited his house, and had discovered all his secret places. In the circumstances the house was no safe place for the King, and he could think of no better asylum than his barn. There Charles and Richard lay all the next day, Friday, September 5th, concealed behind the corn and hay.

Towards evening Mr. Wolfe was gladdened by the unexpected return of his son, and, so soon as it was dark, the two came together to the barn to discuss Charles's future plans. His idea of crossing the Severn was, they assured him, absolutely impracticable, so strictly was the river watched and guarded. His best course would be to retire to Boscobel and there await some chance of escape. Reluctantly convinced, Charles decided to follow their advice and depart at once, since all agreed that a longer stay at Madeley would be excessively dangerous. Late at night, he was admitted to the house, where supper was laid before him and everything possible was done to ensure his comfort and safety. Mrs. Wolfe, thinking him insufficiently disguised, stained his face and hands 'of a reeky colour,' with the juice of

walnut leaves; and her husband substituted for the grey, worsted stockings, a pair of green yarn ones, which, he hoped, would be less galling to the King's blistered feet. Thus refreshed, and supplied by his host with a small sum of money, Charles set out on his return journey, about eleven o'clock at night.

Not wishing to encounter the militant miller, he proposed to evade the bridge at Evelith, and inquired of Richard how deep the brook was, and whether he could swim. Richard replied to the last question in the negative, adding that it was 'a scurvy river, not easy to be passed in all places.' But Charles refused to be daunted, and undertook to bring his guide across. 'Upon which' says he, 'we went over some closes to the river-side, and I, entering the river first, to see whether I could myself go over, who knew how to swim, found it but a little above my middle; and thereupon, taking Richard Penderel by the hand, I helped him over.'[1]

The rest of the journey was accomplished with difficulty. The King's feet were already so sore that he could hardly walk, and now the sand, that had filled his shoes and stockings in the passage of the river, caused him positive torture. For the only time during his wanderings, courage failed him, and he threw himself on the ground, imploring Richard to leave him, and vowing that he would rather die than walk another step. But Richard, 'sometimes promising that the way should be better, and sometimes assuring him that he had but little further to go,'[2] beguiled him onwards as far as Whiteladies. There they learnt that Wilmot was safe at Moseley Hall, and, somewhat cheered, they continued their way to Boscobel, which they reached about three o'clock on the morning of September 6th.[3]

Charles again waited outside, while Richard went forward to ascertain that there were no soldiers in the house. But very soon he was rejoiced by the sight of

[1] Hughes, *King's Account*, p. 140.
[2] *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. p. 86. [3] *Hughes*, pp. 141, 206.

1651 September 6th-16th

his faithful guide returning in the company of Colonel Carlos, the same who had so gallantly assisted to cover the retreat from Worcester. The meeting moved both King and subject to tears, and, when the first access of emotion was over, they entered the house together. There Charles partook of 'a posset of thin milk and small beer,' hastily prepared by William Penderel's wife, Joan, who also washed his feet and dried his shoes and stockings. That done, Carlos proposed to pass the day in a tree in the wood, asserting that it would be unsafe to remain in the house, since both that and the wood would probably be searched. Having selected a pollarded and ivy-covered oak which stood in rather an open space, near a bridle-path, they climbed into it by the help of a ladder, and a couple of pillows and some bread and cheese were handed up after them by William Penderel. The wisdom of Carlos' plan was soon apparent, for soldiers arrived to search the wood, and went continually up and down it, being, however, skilfully diverted from the King's neighbourhood by Joan Penderel, who, with her husband, went 'peaking up and down, she being commonly near the place with a nut-hook in her hand, gathering of sticks.'[1]

But not even the excitement of watching the search for himself could keep Charles awake, so exhausted was he with his three nights of danger, toil, and watching. Very soon he fell asleep in the colonel's arms, and slept so long and so soundly that Carlos at last became numbed by his cramped position and the pressure of the King's weight. Finding himself unable to support him longer, he feared Charles's fall from the tree, yet dared not speak loud enough to wake him, lest the soldiers should overhear. Wherefore he was 'constrained to practise so much incivility as to pinch his Majesty to the end he might awake him to prevent his present danger.'[2]

[1] Fea, Tract i. pp. 211-12. Hughes's *Boscobel*, p. 206. *Harleian Miscellany*, iv. p. 444.

[2] Fea, *Flight of the King*, p. 56.

When evening fell they returned to the house, and for a while Charles sat in the garden, drinking some wine that Richard Penderel had purchased in Wolverhampton. While he sat there he was joined by Humphrey Penderel, who informed him that, with a view of gathering news, he had been to Shiffnal, on the pretext of paying a tax due from his mistress. While he was engaged in this business, a colonel of the Commonwealth had entered, and, hearing that he came from Whiteladies, interrogated him regarding the report that the King had been there, taking care to lay before him 'as well the penalty for concealing the King, which was death without mercy, as the reward for discovering him, which should be one thousand pounds certain pay.'[1] The sturdy miller, unmoved by fear of punishment or hope of reward, replied with great discretion that 'the King had been there, as was supposed, but there was no likelihood for him to stay there, for there were three families in the house and all at a difference one with another.'

Humphrey related this story as a good joke, but it filled the King with a sudden misgiving lest the price set on his head should prove too great a temptation to some of the poor people acquainted with his secret, and, for a moment, his face betrayed his thought. The doubt endured, however, for a moment only, and was speedily allayed by the eager assurances of Carlos and Humphrey that 'if it were one hundred thousand pounds it would be no more to the purpose.'[2]

He slept that night in one of the secret hiding-places of the house, according to contemporary evidence, the hole in the floor of the 'cheese-room' or garret, though modern tradition assigns this refuge to Carlos, while the King is supposed to have occupied a recess in the great chimney-stack, communicating, on one side, with the principal bedroom, on the other with the garden.'[3]

[1] Hughes's *Tracts*, *Blount*, p. 208.

[2] Fea, *Flight of the King*, pp. 213-14. *Harleian Miscellany*, iv. p. 445.

[3] Fea, *Flight of the King*, pp. 41-5, and note.

1651 September 7th-17th

But if his bedroom was secure it was very far from comfortable. He slept 'very incommodiously, with little or no rest, for that the place was not long enough for him,' and, having no temptation to linger in bed, he rose early and walked in the long gallery, 'where he had the advantage of a window, which surveyed the road from Tong to Brewood.'[1] In the meantime Carlos and William had sallied forth on a foraging expedition. Charles had eaten little during the last few days, but on the previous evening his appetite had suddenly returned, and he had expressed a desire for some mutton. This William dared not buy lest the indulgence in so unusual a luxury should excite the curiosity of his neighbours, and as he had no sheep of his own, the only alternative was to 'make bold with the sheep of some one else.' Accordingly they chose one from the flock of a certain Staunton, who rented a part of the Boscobel lands, killed it, and brought the desired leg of mutton in triumph to the King. Charles was much pleased with the result of the foray, and at once set to work to prepare breakfast. Having cut some 'Scotch collops,' he 'pricked them with the knife point, then called for a frying-pan and butter, and fried the collops himself.' Carlos was allowed to turn them in the pan, while the King held it, and this incident, we are told, 'yielded the King a pleasant jocular discourse, after his return to France, when it amounted to a question, a very difficult case, who was cook and who was scullion? And the solution of the doubt, when it could not be decided by the lords then present, was referred to the judgment of his Majesty's master-cook, who affirmed that the King was both of them.'[2]

It should be added that William Penderel, at a later date, offered the price of the sheep to Staunton. But the latter understanding that his property had been sacrificed to distressed Cavaliers, refused to accept the money.

[1] Fea, Tract i. p. 215. *Hughes*, p. 209.

[2] Fea, *Flight of the King*, p. 215. *Blount*, pp. 209-10. *Harleian Miscellany*, iv. p. 445.

1651 September 4th-14th

After breakfast John Penderel came to know if all was well, and was promptly despatched to Moseley, with inquiries after Wilmot. The rest of the day, which was Sunday, September 7th, Charles passed 'in a pretty arbour in Boscobel garden,' occupied with 'his devotions' and 'in reading the Scriptures.' The Penderel brothers, meanwhile, kept continual watch on the roads and avenues leading to the house.[1]

During all this time Wilmot had forborne to make good his own escape until he had ascertained how it fared with the King. And his action, on this occasion, shows a disinterested generosity that sufficiently belies the doubts cast on his courage and loyalty, though there were not wanting those who impugned both. His first intention had been to ride straight along the high-road to London, as a person without fear, and, guided by John Penderel, he had actually made the attempt. But this bold plan soon proved impracticable. The whole way was 'so pestered with soldiers,' that the Cavalier was at last force to hide, with his horse, in a marle-pit, while John went to seek 'a more commodious lurking-place.' This he found at the house of a Mr. Huntbach, near Brinsford, and, having left Wilmot there, and concealed his two horses in a barn, the faithful Penderel went on to Wolverhampton, where he hoped to discover some safer refuge. In this he was disappointed, but, as he returned disconsolately homeward, he had the good fortune to encounter a priest of his acquaintance, Father John Hudleston by name. To him he poured out the sad story of the King's defeat at Worcester and subsequent flight to Whiteladies, concluding with the relation of his own dilemma concerning Wilmot, who would, he feared, be certainly taken if left much longer at Brinsford. Hudleston thereupon took John home with him to Moseley Hall, where he repeated his story to the owner of the

[1] *Fea*, p. 244. *Blount*, pp. 209-10. Bates's *Elenchus Motuum*, Pt. II. p. 134.

house, John Whitgreave, a Roman Catholic gentleman, who had served the late King as a lieutenant under Thomas Giffard. Whitgreave listened with sympathetic attention, and at once expressed his readiness to receive Wilmot under his own roof. There—should need arise—he could be safely concealed in the 'priest's hole,' a dismal little place, devoid of light and air, to which entrance was afforded by a trap-door in the floor of a cupboard, adjoining the best bedroom.[1] Wilmot was accordingly brought to Moseley by Huntbach on the night of Thursday, September 4th, and, having been shown the secret hiding-place, he expressed himself so well satisfied with his quarters that he wished a hundred thousand of his friends were with him. His horses remained a difficulty for Whitgreave, whose stables were 'obvious to the common street,' had no such secure accommodation for them as for their owner. It was, therefore, decided to commit them to the keeping of Colonel Lane at Bentley, whither they were taken early on Friday morning by Walker, the priest of Whiteladies. Lane, who had formerly served in Wilmot's brigade, accepted the perilous charge willingly, and hastened to visit his old commander the same night. Thinking his own house less liable to suspicion than that of a 'Papist,' he entreated Wilmot to become his guest, and explained that a way of escape was already opened, for his sister, Jane, having obtained a pass for herself and a serving-man to travel to Bristol, could take the fugitive Cavalier thither in the guise of her servant. But Wilmot's first thought was for the King, and he declined to leave his present refuge, merely thanking the colonel for his kindness, and begging him to delay his sister's departure until further notice. Lane had not long been gone when John Penderel arrived with the news that the King had already set out for Wales, and Wilmot, deeming himself now at liberty to accept the colonel's generous offer of assistance, took a grateful leave of his host, and at once

1651 September 5th-15th

[1] Fea, *Flight of the King*, p. 71.

1651 September 7th-17th

departed for Bentley, which he reached in the small hours of Saturday morning.[1]

On the next day, Sunday, Whitgreave and Hudleston were walking peacefully together in the Long Walk 'on the backside of the orchard,' when, to their surprise and alarm, they saw John Penderel hurrying towards them 'with a frightful countenance and much impetuosity.'

'Where is my lord?' he gasped breathlessly as he approached.

They answered that Wilmot was gone.

'Then we are all undone!' ejaculated John, in dismay, 'for the King, finding the passages over Severn all guarded with soldiers, and no possibility of getting into Wales, is come back to Boscobel, and we know not what to do with him, nor how to dispose of him!'

His hearers were filled with consternation, and, having first offered a mass for the King's safety, all three repaired to Bentley, where, in conference with Wilmot, it was agreed to bring the King that night to Moseley.

The distance between Moseley and Boscobel is some nine or ten miles, and as Charles's footsore condition made walking an impossibility, he was obliged to ride Humphrey Penderel's mill-horse. Having taken leave of Carlos, who soon after reached Holland, and was the first person to inform the Princess of Orange of her brother's safety, Charles set out about eleven o'clock on Sunday night. He was attended by the five Penderels and Francis Yates, all armed with clubs and bill-hooks, and carrying pistols in their pockets, ready to fight to the last in the King's defence. The night was dark and rainy, the roads slippery with mud, and progress consequently slow. It is said that Humphrey Penderel, in reply to some remark of the King on the slow and heavy paces of his steed, retorted readily: 'My liege, can you blame the horse to go heavily when he has the weight of three kingdoms on his back?' a sally which Charles

[1] *Boscobel Tracts*, Whitgreave, pp. 265-9. Fea, Tract ii. pp. 223-6. *Summary of Occurrences*, pp. 9-14.

1651 September 8th-18th

did not fail to appreciate. Near Pendeford Mill, while still two miles from his destination, Charles was forced to dismount and pursue his journey across the meadows on foot. Forgetting that three of the Penderels were to return with the horse, he was about to pass on, when he suddenly perceived that they were no longer with him, and turned back hastily, holding out his hand and saying:

'My troubles make me forget myself. I thank you all.'[1]

It was already two hours past midnight—the appointed time of meeting, when the little party entered the field in which Hudleston expected them. Passing through the orchard and down the Long Walk, they were met at the back door by Whitgreave, who with difficulty singled the King out from among the peasants. 'He was so habitted like one of them that I could not tell which was hee; only that I knew all the rest, I could scarce putt off my hatt to him,' he says.

Here Charles bade farewell to the friends who had served him so devotedly. Yates he saw no more, for the poor man was shortly afterwards arrested on the charge of guiding the King from Worcester, and hanged for refusing to say where he had left him. Yet he was not forgotten at the Restoration, when a pension of £50 per annum was granted to his widow, payable to herself and her heirs for ever. All the Penderels lived to see happier days, and to be received as the honoured guests of their Sovereign at Whitehall. To them also annuities were granted—William and Richard receiving £100 and the other brothers 100 marks per annum, with remainder to their heirs. Further, all members of the family were exempted from the penalties of the 'recusancy laws,' to which, as Roman Catholics, they were liable.[2]

While Whitgreave provided the escort with refreshment in the buttery, Hudleston led the King upstairs

[1] *Whitgreave*, Hughes, pp. 269-71. *Blount*, Hughes, pp. 211-14. Fea, Tract i. and ii. pp. 216-18, 226-7. *Harleian Miscellany*, iv. pp. 445-7. *Summary of Occurrences*, pp. 15-18.

[2] *Boscobel Tracts*, pp. 82-3, 337-9. *Flight of the King*, p. 13 (see *Petitions*, *Cal. State Papers*, 1663-64).

to Wilmot, who had arrived several hours earlier, and had awaited 'his friend,' as he called the King—in the belief that his host was ignorant of his identity—in an agony of impatience. As the night wore on and still the royal guest came not, Wilmot's impatience became acute apprehension and almost despair, so that it was with an ecstasy of relief that he threw himself at the King's feet and embraced his knees.

Charles raised him instantly, kissing his cheek and asking eagerly: 'Where is Buckingham? What is become of Cleveland—Derby, and the rest?'

To such questions there could be no answer, and Wilmot welcomed the diversion of Whitgreave's arrival, to whom he turned, saying, as he indicated Charles: 'This is my master, your master, and the master of us all, to whom we all owe our duty and allegiance.'

Whitgreave knelt to kiss Charles's hand, who assured him warmly that he fully appreciated his loyalty, and could never forget either him or Hudleston; then asked, rather abruptly: 'Where is the private place my lord tells me of?' Whitgreave at once led him to the priest's hole, which he entered, remarking cheerfully as he emerged that it was 'the best place he had ever been in.'

Returning to the bedroom, he sat down by the fire while Hudleston washed his feet, which he found to be 'most sadly galled,' and substituted easy slippers and new stockings for the old 'cobbled shoes' and darned hose. Charles was also persuaded to exchange his 'coarse, patched, harden shirt, which by its roughness extremely incommoded him,' for one of Hudleston's new holland shirts; but nothing would induce him to part with his 'rough, crooked thorn-stick,' and he resolutely rejected the offer of gloves.

His toilet completed, he ate some biscuits and drank a glass of sack, after which his spirits rose, and he announced confidently: 'I am now ready for another march; and, if it shall please God once more to place

me at the head of but eight or ten thousand good men of one mind, and resolved to fight, I shall not doubt to drive those rogues out of my kingdoms.'

He continued the conversation for another hour, but at last fatigue overcame him, and, about five o'clock on Monday morning, he lay down on his bed to take some rest. Wilmot also was in need of sleep, but ere he retired he drew Whitgreave aside to exhort him to keep a vigilant watch for soldiers, adding: 'If it should so fall out that the rebels have intelligence of your harbouring any of the King's party, and should, therefore, put you to any torture for confession, be sure you discover me first, which may haply satisfy them and preserve the King.'

While it was still early Whitgreave sent out all his servants on various pretexts, with the exception of the cook, a Roman Catholic, to whom he confided that a Cavalier from Worcester, a relation of Father Hudleston, was in hiding in the house. The same story was also told to Father Hudleston's three young pupils—Sir John Preston, Francis Reynolds, and Thomas Paylin—who, with himself, resided at Moseley, the two last named being Whitgreave's nephews. The boys were given a holiday during the refugee's stay, and bidden to keep a sharp watch on the roads that they might quickly give the alarm on the approach of danger. This duty they thoroughly enjoyed, and little Sir John afforded much amusement to his elders by exclaiming that night at supper: 'Eat hard boys! For we have been on the life-guard and hard duty this day.'

There was, however, no serious alarm. Charles rose in the course of the morning, and was taken by Wilmot to see old Mrs. Whitgreave, his host's mother, whom he 'graciously saluted.' Dinner was then served in Hudleston's room, Whitgreave himself bringing up the dishes, and Charles insisted on the old lady sitting down with him, while her son and Hudleston waited. In the afternoon Whitgreave went to Wolverhampton for news, and

1651 September 9th-19th

John Penderel, who had remained when his brethren departed, went to bring the horses from Bentley, whither Wilmot returned as soon as it was dark to arrange for Charles's removal thither. The King slept that night on Hudleston's bed, the priest keeping watch within doors, while Whitgreave patrolled the grounds.

Next morning Charles, finding the door of Whitgreave's study open, entered and looked out of the window over the porch, whence he could see what passed on the high-road. It was a melancholy sight that met his eyes, for straggling along the road, all wounded, tattered, and starving, were numbers of Royalist soldiers, and among them Highlanders of the King's own regiment, whom he knew.

The men, starving, yet afraid to beg, were eating cabbage-stalks and other refuse gathered from the wayside, and, though Mrs. Whitgreave gave them food and dressed the wounds of those who came to her, no permanent relief could be offered them.

The mournful spectacle turned Charles's thoughts back to Worcester, and he began to talk of the battle, complaining of the conduct of the Scots, and inquiring into the attitude of the surrounding country. Mrs. Whitgreave told him 'for divertisement' of a report that three kings had come to his aid, to which he answered smiling: 'Surely they are the three Kings of Cologne come down from Heaven, for I can imagine none else!'

He then examined Hudleston's books, and, having read a manuscript entitled, 'A Short and Plain Way to the Faith and the Church,' remarked: 'I have not seen anything more plain and clear upon this subject!' He also glanced through Durberville's *Catechism or Abridgement of Christian Doctrine*, and put it in his pocket, saying, 'it was a pretty book, and he would take it along with him.'

It was evident that the removal from Boscobel had taken place none too soon, for the searchers, who had at first gone too far afield, were now returning to

prosecute their investigations near at hand. On Monday, September 8th, the very day after Charles's departure thence, Boscobel was twice searched. The militia came first and did their duty 'with some civility,' but they were followed by regular troops, who threatened William Penderel's life and terrified his wife, Joan; all, however, to no purpose.

On the next day, Tuesday, a party came to White-ladies, led thither by the extorted confession of a prisoner who had shared the King's flight from Worcester. Presenting a pistol to George Giffard's breast, they commanded him to surrender 'Charles Stuart,' but he adhered steadily to the story formerly told by Humphrey Penderel, saying that 'divers Cavaliers came there on Wednesday night, eat up their provision and departed, and that he was as ignorant who they were as whence they came and whither they went.' Reiterated threats wrung from him no more than a request for leave to pray before he died. One of the rough troopers called out: 'If you can tell us no news you shall say no prayers.' But his officer quieted him and proceeded to question Anne Andrews, who maintained as imperturbable a front as Giffard had done. Despairing of learning anything from the inhabitants, the soldiers next searched the house, examined every hole and corner, broke down the wainscoting, and, having done as much damage as possible, departed at last unsatisfied.

That same afternoon, as Charles was lying half-asleep on Hudleston's bed, Whitgreave, watching from the window, saw one of his neighbours running swiftly towards the house, and a few minutes later the cook rushed upstairs, crying: 'Soldiers! Soldiers are coming!' Charles, starting from the bed, hurried to the hiding-hole, and Whitgreave, having carefully closed it, went out to meet the soldiers at the door, in the hope that his immediate surrender would prevent a search of the house. 'As soon as they saw me and knew who I was,' he says, 'they were readie to pull mee in pieces and take mee

away with them, saying I was come from Worcester fight.' But 'after much dispute,' he succeeded in convincing them that ill-health had kept him at home, and, as the neighbours corroborated this statement, he was released. The troopers lingered in the village while their commander, known as 'Southall, the Priest-catcher,' interrogated the people, offering £1000 for the capture of the King, but they made no attempt to search the Hall, and at last departed peaceably.

When all were safely gone, Whitgreave and Hudleston helped the King out of his refuge, and the priest took occasion to remark :

'Your Majesty is, in some sort, in the same condition with me now—liable to dangers and perils, but I hope that God who brought you hither will preserve you here.'

Charles answered earnestly :

'If it please God I come to my crown, both you and all of your persuasion shall have as much liberty as any of my subjects.'

He then begged to be shown the chapel, and was conducted by Hudleston to the room in the garret which served the family for their place of worship. Having seen it he observed that it was 'a very decent place,' and added, looking at the altar, that 'he had an altar, crucifix, and silver candlesticks of his own till my Lord of Holland brake them.'

For the rest of the evening he was 'very cheerful,' but as midnight approached, when he was to leave Moseley for Bentley, he became anxious about his hosts. Assuring them that he was 'very sensible' of the danger they had incurred on his behalf, he presented them with letters of credit to a London merchant, who would, he said, furnish them with money and the means of escape to France if ever they found themselves in peril.

At twelve o'clock Whitgreave and his nephew, Francis Reynolds went out to seek Colonel Lane, whom they found waiting with the horses in the appointed place.

1651 September 10th-20th

Leaving the boy to hold the horses, Whitgreave brought Lane to 'the orchard style,' and, entering the house alone, informed the King that his escort was ready.

Before setting forth, all knelt to offer up a solemn prayer for the safety of the royal fugitive, after which Charles took leave of his hostess, kissing her cheek, and thanking her warmly for her 'kind entertainment'; nor did he disdain to accept the 'sweet meats' with which the old lady insisted on filling his pockets. Turning from her to Whitgreave and Hudleston, he repeated his thanks, promising to remember them 'if it pleased God to restore him,' and passed out into the darkness. The night was cold, and Hudleston threw his cloak about the King, whom he deemed too thinly clad. Charles then mounted, while John Penderel held his stirrup, and so, with a few final words of farewell, he rode away with Lane for Bentley.

For some time after these occurrences Whitgreave and Hudleston judged it prudent to absent themselves from the neighbourhood, but their share in the King's escape did not transpire, and they were able to return home in safety. Both survived to the Restoration, when Whitgreave and Francis Reynolds received pensions of £200 per annum, and enjoyed the same immunity from religious persecution as did the Penderels. Hudleston had, before then, become a Benedictine monk, and that order obtained, in consequence, special marks of royal favour. He lived to be an old man, surviving the King whom he had succoured, and to whom he administered the last sacraments on his death-bed.[1]

Charles arrived at Bentley early in the morning of Wednesday, September 10th, and, after a brief conference with Wilmot and Lane, in which it was settled that he should pass for the son of a tenant who had undertaken to conduct Mistress Jane as far as Bristol, he lay down to take a few hours' rest.

[1] *Flight of the King*, pp. 77, 331. Tract ii. pp. 230-6. Hughes's *Boscobel*, p. 78. *Blount*, pp. 215-22. *Whitgreave*, pp. 272-6. *Summary of Occurrences*, pp. 19-33.

At daybreak he was roused by Lane, who provided him with a cloak and suit of grey cloth 'as near as could be contrived like the holiday suit of a farmer's son,' and informed him that he was to be known henceforth as 'Will Jackson.' They then went to the stables, where Lane gave Charles some instruction in his duties, saddled his horse, and, having mounted him, bade him come round to the house door. Charles duly arrived there, with his hat under his arm, but Lane had omitted to tell him how to mount a lady, and, seeing him hesitate, was forced to say:

'Will, thou must give my sister thy hand!'

Charles essayed to do so, but unfortunately offered his hand the wrong way, upon which old Mrs. Lane, who had come to the door with her daughter, burst out laughing, and asked her son 'what goodly horseman' his sister had got to ride before her?

Mistress Jane's party consisted of five persons, herself and the King, Henry Lascelles, her cousin, and Mr. and Mrs Petre, her brother-in-law and elder sister, who were returning to their home in Buckinghamshire, after a visit to Bentley. They had not been more than two hours on the way when the King's horse cast a shoe and they were forced to halt at Bromsgrove in order to get it replaced. During the operation Charles, holding the horse's hoof, entered into conversation with the smith.

'What news?' he asked.

'Why, nothing!' returned the man, 'save that the Lord General hath routed the Scots.'

Charles, thinking anxiously of his friends, inquired whether any of the English had been taken, and was answered that some had been captured, but not 'that rogue, Charles Stuart.'

'Perhaps,' he suggested, 'he hath got by the byways back into Scotland.'

'No,' said the smith, 'that is not likely; he rather lurks somewhere in England, and I wish I knew where, for I might get a thousand pounds by taking him.'

'Well!' replied Charles cheerfully, 'if the rogue be taken, he deserves to be hanged more than all the rest, for bringing in the Scots!'

'You speak like an honest man!' cried the smith.

And so they parted, mutually pleased with one another.[1]

The next adventure befell them near Wotton, where an old woman, who was gleaning in a field, glanced at 'Will Jackson,' and cried out suddenly: 'Master, don't you see a troop of horse before you?'

They then perceived a party of soldiers lying on the ground while their horses fed beside them. Petre, though unacquainted with the identity of his travelling companion, was seized with panic and refused to go forward. Charles whispered in Jane's ear that it might be fatal to turn back, and that sooner or later they would inevitably meet the soldiers. But 'all she could say in the world would not do,' and they were forced to turn to the left and enter Stratford from another side. The manœuvre availed nothing, and, as Charles had foreseen, they again encountered the troop near the town. The soldiers, however, suffered them to pass through their midst without molestation, parting their ranks, right and left, and 'civilly giving hat for hat.'

At Stratford the Petres took leave of the rest, going towards Horton in Buckinghamshire, while the others pursued their way to Long Marston, six miles beyond Stratford-on-Avon, where they slept the night at the house of a Mr. John Tomes. There, while Charles sat in the kitchen in his character of 'Will Jackson,' the cook bade him wind up the roasting-jack. He endeavoured to oblige her, but hit it the wrong way, upon which she demanded angrily: 'What countryman are you, that know not how to wind up a jack?'

'I am a poor tenant's son of Colonel Lane in Staffordshire,' he responded readily: 'we seldom have roast meat, but when we have we don't use a jack.'

[1] *King's Account*, p. 145. Fea, Tract iii. p. 248. *Bates*, pp. 135-8.

1651 September 11th-21st

And with this soft answer he succeeded in turning aside her wrath.[1]

The same night Wilmot and Lane, who, taking with them hawks and spaniels, had followed at a distance through the fields, slept at Packington Hall, the house of Sir Clement Fisher, who, at a later date, became the husband of Jane Lane. On the following morning Lane took his departure for London, where he hoped to get a pass for 'Will Jackson' for France. Wilmot continued his journey southwards, attended by his man, Robert Swan, and with no better disguise than a hawk carried on his wrist. 'I never could get my Lord Wilmot to put on any disguise, he saying that he should look frightfully in it,' asserted Charles.

On Thursday, September 11th, the King and his companions made an uneventful journey of thirty-six miles, and slept at the Crown Inn at Cirencester. There Charles shared the room of Lascelles, who was in the secret, and took care to offer the best bed to the King, himself taking the 'truckle-bed' provided for Will Jackson. On Friday the third and last stage of the journey was performed, and, passing through Bristol, a place so familiar to Charles that 'he could not but send his eyes abroad to view the alterations made there,' they came safely to their destination, Abbots Leigh, three miles to the west of the city.

September 12th-22nd

Though the loyalty of the host and hostess, Mr. and Mrs. Norton, was unquestionable, their discretion was less certain, and it had been agreed to conceal the rank of their guest from them. Jane Lane therefore confided Will Jackson to the care of the butler, explaining that he was one of her father's tenants, and was suffering severely from ague, for which reason she begged that he might be given all possible comforts and attention. Charles's looks bore out her statement. 'My late fatigues and want of meat had indeed made me look a little pale,' he says, and

[1] This anecdote has many versions, but Blount's, as given above, is probably correct.

the good-natured butler took him at once to his bedroom, gave him a good supper, and afterwards brought Mrs. Norton's own maid to make him 'a carduus posset.' 1651 September 13th-23rd

For that night Charles was saved from the necessity of making the other servants' acquaintance, but on the following morning he woke early, and, feeling very hungry, went down to the buttery in search of breakfast. There he found Pope, the butler, and several other men engaged in drinking ale and eating bread and butter, while they listened to a discourse on the battle of Worcester, delivered by 'one that looked like a country-fellow.' His description of the fight was so accurate that Charles took him for one of Cromwell's soldiers, and, sitting down beside him, inquired how he knew so much about the matter. The man replied that he had been in the King's regiment, and a few more questions elicited the fact that he had indeed served in Major Broughton's company of Guards.

'Have you ever seen the King?' asked Charles carelessly.

'Twenty times,' returned the other.

'What kind of a man is he, then?' persisted Charles.

He received, in reply, an exact description of the horse he had ridden, and the clothes he had worn at Worcester. In conclusion, the speaker added, looking steadily at him: 'The King is just four fingers' breadth taller than you.' 'Upon which I made what haste I could out of the buttery,' says Charles, 'being more afraid when I knew he was one of our soldiers than when I took him for one of the enemy's.'

But his perils were not yet over. As he passed through the hall, with Pope, he was constrained to lift his hat to Mrs. Norton, whereat he observed the butler to start, and to gaze very earnestly into his face. Replacing his hat, with an air of complete unconsciousness, he strolled out into the garden, where he watched some young men playing fives. They invited him to join their game, but this he 'modestly refused,' on the plea of 'unskilfulness.'

In less that an hour he returned to his room, and was joined by Lascelles, who exclaimed anxiously: 'What shall we do? I am afraid Pope knows you, for he says very positively to me that it is you, but I have denied it.'

Charles asked if the man were 'honest,' and being answered in the affirmative, summoned him to his room, and gave him his hand to kiss. Pope thereupon protested his incorruptible loyalty, and explained that he had known the King as a boy at Richmond, when he served Sir Thomas Jermyn, and had later fought in the royal army, under Colonel Bagot. Charles was satisfied, and took the man into his confidence, saying that he hoped to sail from Bristol for France or Spain. Pope expressed his readiness to make inquiries about vessels sailing for the desired ports, but, when Charles added that he was expecting Wilmot to join him, he exclaimed in horror. That officer was, he said, known to several of the household, all of whom were not trustworthy, and, should he come to Abbots Leigh in daylight, his recognition would be inevitable.

To prevent this catastrophe he himself went to meet Wilmot as he came from Dyrham, where he had been the guest of Sir John Winter, and lodged him in a neighbouring village. That done, Pope went on to Bristol, to seek out a ship for the King.

His search proved fruitless; there were no vessels ready to sail for either France or Spain within a month, and, returning at nightfall, he brought Wilmot secretly to Charles's bedroom, where he informed them of his bad success. Being invited to give his advice as to what was best to be done next, he said that it was absolutely impossible for the King to remain long at Abbots Leigh, but that he might find safety in the house of Colonel Francis Wyndham, who had married Anne, one of the co-heiresses of Thomas Gerard of Trent, and lived at the Manor-House there, with his wife and mother. The idea pleased Charles, for the Wyndhams were his personal

friends, Francis being the youngest brother of Edmund Wyndham, whom the young King had been so anxious to make Secretary of State. It was therefore decided that Wilmot should immediately proceed to Trent, which lay on the borders of Somerset and Dorset, some few miles from Sherborne, in order to prepare the family for the royal visit. Charles himself was to follow on Tuesday, September 16th. In the interval he kept to his room as much as possible, feigning a return of his ague, a pretence which Jane Lane did her best to keep up, by professing great concern at his illness, and constantly exclaiming: '"Oh this boy will never recover; he'll ne'er be good again!" and the like.'[1] 1651 September 14th-24th

But on Monday, the eve of their departure, their plans were threatened by the sudden illness of Mrs. Norton, who gave birth to a still-born child, and appeared to be herself in the utmost danger. That Jane Lane should leave her friend at such a time without some reasonable excuse was not to be thought of, but Charles's invention was equal to the occasion. Between them he and Lascelles wrote a letter purporting to come from Bentley, which contained news of old Mr. Lane's dangerous illness, and commanded his daughter to return at once if she hoped to see him alive. This letter was handed to Jane by Pope at supper-time and she, having read it, burst into tears and passed it round the table, acting her distress so well that no one entertained the least doubt of its genuineness. In the circumstances there could, of course, be no objection to her departure, and Charles, professing a temporary recovery, went early next morning to the stables and prepared the horses for the journey; this time he rode single, in charge of the portmanteau, while Lascelles' horse carried the lady. On starting they took the road for Bristol in pursuance of the fiction that they were bound for Bentley, but turned, so soon as they were safely out of sight, and rode southwards for September 15th-25th

September 16th-26th

[1] *Flight of the King*, p. 101, note. Symonds's *Diary*, Harleian MSS. 991, fol. 90.

1651 September 16th-26th

Castle Cary, where they passed the night, at the house of Edward Kirton, steward to Lord Hertford.[1]

On the same evening Wilmot, with Swan and a man from Dyrham, named Rogers, arrived at Trent and sent in word to Wyndham that 'a gentleman, a friend of his, desired the favour of him that he would be pleased to step forth and speak with him.' Rather puzzled, the colonel went out as requested and found Wilmot walking about near the stables. Recognising him immediately, in spite of the darkness, he greeted him by name, and, when the other expressed surprise at this, retorted that it was 'nothing strange . . . considering his lordship was not in the least altered, except a hawk on his fist and a lure at his side might pass for a disguise.' Such temerity, he added in a tone not entirely complimentary, 'really begat admiration!' The rebuke was not wholly undeserved, but Wilmot let it pass and proceeded to unfold his errand, thereby sending Frank Wyndham into transports of joy. The honest colonel had believed the report of the King's death, and could not now sufficiently express his relief and satisfaction. Regardless of his own danger, he declared that 'for his Majesty's preservation he would value neither life, family, nor fortune,' and, so saying, he dragged his guest into the parlour, where he exacted from him a detailed account of all that had happened since the battle of Worcester. Being satisfied on these points, he returned to the consideration of the present predicament, and decided that, out of his household of twenty persons, six must be permitted to share the secret, namely, Lady Wyndham, his mother; Anne, his wife; Juliana Coningsby, his cousin; his man, Henry Peters; and two maid-servants, Eleanor Withers and Joan Halsenoth. To this Wilmot agreed, and on the following morning the chosen six were duly informed of the perilous honour about to be conferred on them. They received the news with the same generous satisfaction and

[1] *Blount*, pp. 242-5; *King's Account*, pp. 146-51; Fea, Tract iii. pp. 249-53. *Bates*, pp. 138-40.

cheerful courage that the colonel himself had shown, and, having devised various errands to take the other servants out of the way, they proceeded to prepare for the King's reception. Four rooms were set aside for his use, and Lady Wyndham gave up her own bedroom, which communicated with the Secret Chamber, a little recess provided with a double floor, between the boards of which a man could lie. All being satisfactorily arranged, the colonel and his wife went out into the fields as though to take a walk, between nine and ten o'clock in the morning, and were presently gratified by the sight of a haggard-looking youth, neatly but plainly dressed, and carrying a portmanteau on his saddle, who cried out joyously, as he rode towards them: 'Frank! Frank! How dost thou do?' 1651 September 17th-27th

Restraining their transports with difficulty, they hurried him and his companions into the house, where—in the privacy of old Lady Wyndham's room—the assembled family gave free play to its emotions. For a while the ladies wept copiously; but the King's cheerful manner and evident delight at being again amongst old friends soon dried their tears, and they retired, somewhat comforted, taking with them Jane Lane, whom they agreed to call 'Cousin' and to treat with the familiarity of near relations.

Wyndham remained behind, and, in the course of conversation, repeated to Charles the words of his father, Sir Thomas Wyndham, who, shortly before his death in 1636, had called his five surviving sons round him and solemnly warned them of approaching trouble, bidding them always be faithful to the King, and concluding with the historic and much-quoted words: 'Though the crown should hang upon a bush, I charge you, forsake it not!'

'These words,' said Francis Wyndham, 'being spoken with much earnestness, both in gesture and manner extraordinary . . . made so firm an impression in all our breasts that the many afflictions of these sad times cannot

1651 September 8th-18th

raze out their indelible characters. Certainly these are the days that my father pointed out in that expression, and I doubt not that God hath brought me through so many dangers that I might show myself both a dutiful son and a loyal subject, in faithfully endeavouring to serve your sacred Majesty in this your greatest distress?'[1]

On the next day, Thursday, September 18th, Jane Lane departed, with her cousin; but her separation from her royal travelling companion proved of brief duration.

November

For, in the following month, rumours of the part she had played became current, and she and her brother were obliged to make their way on foot to Yarmouth, whence they sailed for France. Charles had arrived before them,

December

and, in the early days of December, they were met on the road to Paris by the Duke of York, the Queen, and the King himself. Charles greeted Jane warmly, saluting her as 'My Life,' and his fellow-exiles vied with one another in their desire to honour the woman who had saved their King.

'The King and the Cavaliers do extremely caress them,' reported the English papers.

1652

Colonel Lane returned to England in the next year, and was immediately imprisoned with his father. Jane remained abroad until the Restoration, when she returned with the other exiles and married Sir Clement Fisher.[2]

1660

Charles had more than once lamented that his 'necessityes' prevented him from giving her any token of his gratitude, and expressed the hope that he might live to offer her substantial acknowledgment of his indebtedness. This hope was fulfilled at the Restoration, and thenceforth he took delight in showering gifts upon her. These took the form of miniatures, snuff-boxes, and watches; among the last, a gold watch, which he desired might be handed down in succession to the eldest daughter of the Lane Family. Nor was Colonel Lane

[1] *Mrs. Wyndham's Account*, pp. 308-15, Hughes's *Boscobel*.

[2] *Mercurius Politicus*, 16th Dec. 1651. Eglesfield's *Monarchy Revived*, p. 162. Hughes's *Boscobel*, p. 74.

forgotten. He refused the offer of a peerage, but accepted a pension of £500 with remainder to his son, and for each of his six daughters a dowry of £1000.

The Wyndhams also received suitable rewards. To Colonel Francis Wyndham was given a baronetcy and a pension of £600, payable to himself and his heirs for ever, besides the sum of £1000, 'for the buying of a jewel.' His wife received £400 a year. Juliana Conings by — then Mrs. Amyas Hext — was granted an annuity of £200, and each of the two maids one of £50, with a gift of £100. As neither Pope nor Peters are mentioned, it is probable that they did not live to claim their reward. Rogers, the guide from Dyrham, had a pension of £100 a year, and Swan, Wilmot's servant, had £80 a year, besides the place of Yeoman of the Field to Charles II.[1]

[1] Fea, *Flight of the King*, pp. 104-10, 118-21, 194. Hughes's *Boscobel*, pp. 74-8.

CHAPTER XI

Wyndham's Search for a Ship—Attempt to embark at Charmouth—Adventures at Bridport and Broadwindsor—Return to Trent—Journey to Heale—Quest of Colonel Gounter for a Ship—Journey to Brighton—Charles sails from Shoreham—Lands at Fécamp—Goes to Rouen—Meets his Mother at Moriceaux—Arrives at Paris—Gives a fictitious Account of his Adventures—His Reticence—His Gratitude to all who aided his Escape.

1651 September 18th-28th

EARLY on the morning after Charles's arrival at Trent, Wyndham set out in quest of some one who could procure him a safe passage to France. Giles Strangeways of Melbury, to whom he first applied, proved unable to help him. Most of his friends in Weymouth had been already banished, and now, he said, 'he knew not any master of a ship, or so much as one mariner whom he could trust.' All that he could do for the King was to send him one hundred pounds in gold, protesting that it was 'all he had,' for, during his father's lifetime, he had 'no great command of money.' He advised Wyndham to consult Captain Alford of Lyme Regis, or, failing him, Captain William Ellesdon of the same place, who had some time previously assisted the flight of Sir John Berkeley.

In accordance with this advice Wyndham rode off to Lyme, where he learnt that Captain Alford was absent in Portugal. William Ellesdon was, however, in the town, and to his house Wyndham therefore betook himself. Under a strict pledge of secrecy, he confided his urgent need of a ship to convey the King to France. Ellesdon expressed himself 'ravished' at being offered such an opportunity of testifying his loyalty, and sent at once to

the Custom House to learn who was sailing for France. 1651
Answer was returned that Stephen Limbry of Charmouth —a tenant of his own—had entered his little coasting vessel as bound for St. Malo, and Ellesdon proposed to visit him forthwith. Riding along the shore, that Wyndham might see the spot at which it would be best to embark the King, they came to Charmouth and summoned Limbry to join them at the Queen's Arms. The man came at once, but demurred to Ellesdon's request that he would assist two fugitives from Worcester, fearing the danger of such an enterprise. But the desire to oblige his landlord, and the promise of £60 to be paid on his return, induced him, at last, to yield. It was agreed that he should bring his ship into Charmouth Road before midnight on Monday, September 22nd, and send his long-boat ashore to bring off the passengers from the point named to him by Ellesdon. That done, he was to set sail without delay.

On their return to Lyme, it occurred to Wyndham and September 19th-29th
Ellesdon that the King and his friends would be forced to sit up half the night awaiting the tide, and that, Monday being Fair Day, the inns would be crowded. To meet this difficulty, they sent Peters back on Friday morning to the Queen's Arms at Charmouth, where, for a retaining fee of five shillings, he engaged the two best rooms for Monday night. Having accomplished this, he invited the hostess, Margaret Wade, to drink a glass of wine with him, and, waxing confidential, told her, in strict secrecy, the reason of his engaging the rooms. He served, he said, 'a very gallant master, who had long, most affectionately, loved a lady in Devon, and had the happiness to be well beloved by her.' But the lady was an orphan, and her guardians refused their consent to the match, wherefore it was the intention of the young couple to elope on the Monday following. They desired to rest and refresh themselves at Charmouth, but would be forced to continue their journey before daylight, lest pursuit should overtake them. The good woman, pleased with

1651 the money and touched by the story, readily promised that all should be at the lovers' command, and Wyndham, fully satisfied, returned the same day to Trent. Ellesdon accompanied him a part of the way in order to point out a lonely house among the hills, half-way between Lyme and Charmouth, at which he proposed to meet the King on Monday afternoon.

September 20th-30th The situation at Trent had become more critical during the interval. A trooper had ridden into the village bragging that he had killed the King of Scots, and was clad at that instant in the royal buff coat, whereupon the excited villagers testified their joy by lighting bonfires and ringing the church-bells. Such demonstrations were harmless enough, but their enthusiasm soon took a more dangerous turn, and, on Sunday morning, Wyndham was informed by the village tailor that it was proposed to search his house for concealed Royalists. The colonel thanked the man for his friendly warning, but assured him that there was no occasion for alarm. Certainly, he admitted, he had a kinsman staying with him, but his guest was by no means in hiding, and would doubtless accompany him to church that day. He then reported the conversation to Charles and Wilmot, and the latter agreed to go to church as Wyndham had suggested. The result was entirely satisfactory. The suspicions of the enemy were now allayed, the more because Wyndham was little in the habit of attending the ministrations of Puritan divines, and it was supposed that his pious guest had prevailed with him to do so on this day.

September 21st-October 1st

September 22nd-October 2nd An imminent danger having been averted by this bold measure, the King was able to set out safely on Monday for Charmouth. The distance to be traversed was some twenty-two miles, and Charles, dressed as a groom, rode before Juliana Coningsby, who was to play the part of the runaway bride. They were accompanied by Wyndham, Peters, and Wilmot, the supposed lover. About three o'clock in the afternoon, they reached the half-way house at Monkton Wylde, where Ellesdon awaited them.

He assured them that all was ready for the voyage, and explained that Limbry had represented his passenger to the sailors as 'a broken merchant' flying with his servant from creditors, and bound for St. Malo, where he hoped to recover a part of his property from the dishonest agent who had caused his misfortunes. Ellesdon added that it would be well for the King and Wilmot to 'drop some discourses to this effect' after they had embarked. Charles assented readily, and, thanking Ellesdon for his care, presented him with a piece of foreign gold in which he had bored a hole during his hours of solitude at Trent. 'He told me,' wrote Ellesdon, 'that he had nothing at present to bestow on me but that small piece; but, if ever it should please God to restore him to his kingdoms, he would readily grant me whatsoever favour I might, in reason, petition him for.'

They then parted company. Ellesdon went home to Lyme and the rest to Charmouth. Once again, though he knew it not, Charles had narrowly escaped a threatening danger. The tenant of the house had recognised him, or at least suspected his identity, and, hastening to a neighbour, named Roger, had asked counsel as to whether he should give him up or no. Roger replied that it would be a mean and ungenerous action, and advised his friend that he 'should in nowise betray him, but lett him goe as he came.' The other, accepting this honourable counsel, suffered the hunted King to depart in peace.[1]

An hour after their arrival at the Queen's Arms, the royal party were visited by Limbry, who told them that all was safe, and promised to bring his boat at midnight to the appointed spot. About ten o'clock at night the sailor went home to get some necessaries for the voyage; but, when he asked for his sea-chest, his wife exclaimed in amazement, and demanded the reason of his putting to sea before he had taken in a cargo. Her husband thereupon confessed that he was about to

[1] *Flight of the King*, p. 126.

1651 convey a friend of Mr. Ellesdon over to France, for which service he would be well paid. But it so happened that the woman's head was full of the proclamation of September 10th, which she had heard that day at the Fair, and which set forth the heavy penalties to which all who aided the King, or any of his party, were liable. Jumping to the conclusion that her husband's passenger was a fugitive Royalist, she seized an opportunity to lock the sailor up in his room. Then, speaking through the door, she declared that she and her children 'would not be undone for ever a landlord of them all,' and that if he made the least attempt to escape she should at once give information to Captain Macey, the commander of the militia in the town. The more her husband remonstrated the more violent did she and her two daughters become, until at last, fearing that resistance would only endanger himself and those whom he had hoped to serve, he resigned himself to his fate.

September 23rd-October 3rd

All night the King and Wilmot sat wakeful and anxious in the inn, while Wyndham and Peters watched in no less anxiety on the shore. But the night passed, and no boat came. When at last the tide had turned Wyndham retraced his steps sadly to the inn. As he made his way thither he saw, in the grey light of morning, the figure of a man coming towards him, followed at a short distance by three women. The colonel thought that he recognised the hapless master of the vessel, but though the man's desire to speak was evident, the presence of the women made it impossible. Wyndham therefore returned to the inn unenlightened. It was by that time daybreak, and he urged a quick retreat to Bridport, where he thought they might wait to ascertain the cause of the failure, and whether it would be possible to sail on the next night. Accordingly, he set out at once with Charles and Juliana, while Wilmot and Peters tarried behind to exact an explanation from Ellesdon. For this purpose Peters visited Lyme, but the merchant, astonished and dismayed by his news, could guess at no

other reason for the disaster than that the sailors had drunk so much at the Fair as to be unfit to put to sea.[1]

In the meantime the peculiar conduct of the travellers had roused the suspicions of the ostler, who happened to be one of Macey's men, and he confided to his mistress that he thought the lady was the King in disguise. The good woman had her own suspicions concerning her guests, but she sharply rebuked the man's suggestion, and sent him off to the forge with Wilmot's horse, which had lost a shoe. The smith, looking at the animal's hoofs, asked: 'From whence come these gentlemen?'

'From Exeter, as they say,' returned the ostler.

'Well,' said the smith, 'this horse hath but three shoes, and they were set on in three several counties, and one of them in Worcestershire.' Thereupon the ostler, in great excitement, narrated the events of the night, saying that the horses had stood all the time ready saddled, and that most of the party had departed at daybreak. His suspicions being confirmed by the smith, he rushed off to consult the minister of Charmouth, a man of the name of Wesley. But it happened that the minister was engaged in family prayer, and refused to be interrupted, so that the ostler, fearing to lose his tip on Wilmot's departure, hastened back to the inn without unburdening his mind. 'For which reason,' wrote Ellesdon to Hyde, 'I have been somewhat reconciled to extemporary prayer ever since.'[2] Wilmot thus got off in safety; but he had not been gone long when the minister, having heard the story from the smith, hurried up to the Queen's Arms and greeted the sturdy hostess with the words: 'How now, Margaret? You are a maid of honour now!'

'What mean you by that, Mr. Parson?' she demanded.

'Why,' said he, 'Charles Stuart lay last night at your house and kissed you at his departure, so that you can't but be a maid of honour now!'

[1] Hughes's *Anne Wyndham's Account*, pp. 315-22; *King's Account*, pp. 152-3. Ellesdon's Letter, *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 563-70. *Fea*, pp. 254-6. *Bates*, pp. 141-3.

[2] *Fea*, p. 318.

At that the woman flew into a passion, and reproached the parson fiercely for trying to bring trouble on herself and her house, 'But,' she concluded, 'if I thought it was the King, I should think the better of my lips all the days of my life, and so, Mr. Parson, get you out of my house, or else I 'll get those shall kick you out.' The mortified minister then hastened with the smith to the nearest justice of the peace, Butler of Commer, and demanded a warrant for the arrest of the party that had just left the inn. But Butler, prejudiced by the excited manner of the minister, disbelieved the whole story, and refused to issue the required warrant. Thus it was not until midday, after much precious time had been lost, that the news reached the ears of Captain Macey. He, with a handful of militiamen, at once gave chase along the London road. Charles and his companions had meanwhile reached Bridport, having encountered on the road many people, among them an old servant of the late King, who recognised the fugitive, but had the discretion not to notice him. As they neared the town they perceived it to be full of soldiers, and Wyndham, pulling up abruptly, entreated the King not to enter it. But Charles replied that he had promised to await Wilmot there, and could not abandon him, a proceeding which would be, he remarked, 'very inconvenient, both to him and to me.' He insisted that they must 'go impudently into the best inn in the town and take a chamber there as the only thing to be done.'

The best inn—the George—was, like every other, thronged with soldiers, through whom Charles roughly pushed his way, after the fashion of an accomplished serving-man, who knew that he must fight for his master's accommodation. 'I alighted,' he says, 'and taking the horses, thought it the best way to go blundering in among them, and lead them (the horses) through the middle of the soldiers into the stable, which I did, and they were very angry with me for my rudeness.'

In the stable he removed the horses' bridles and called

the ostler to bring them a feed. The man brought the oats as desired, and, looking closely at the King, exclaimed: 'Sure, sir, I know your face.' Charles was unpleasantly startled, but asked, calmly enough, where the other had lived. The man answered that he had been born at Exeter, and had formerly served at an inn there, next door to the house of Mr. Porter. Charles remembered that the said house was the very one in which he had himself lived at Exeter when a boy, and answered readily: 'Certainly you have seen me, then, at Mr. Porter's, for I served him a good while, above a year.'

'Oh, then, I remember you a boy there,' returned the man, entirely satisfied. And he invited Charles to drink a pot of beer with him. The King excused himself on the plea that he had to wait upon his master, and the ostler, indulging in a few private curses on the soldiers, went about his business.

As Wyndham could not immediately secure either a room or a meal, Charles was forced to linger nearly an hour in the yard, conversing with the soldiers. They told him that they were Colonel Haynes' regiment, 1500 strong, and just about to start on an expedition for the reduction of Jersey or Guernsey. But, at last, much to his relief, he was called upstairs by the colonel, who had obtained some mutton for dinner, of which Charles partook in haste. While he was thus engaged, Juliana, looking out of the window, saw Peters ride into the yard, and he, being beckoned upstairs, told them that Wilmot had seen them at the window as he passed, but had judged it best to seek another inn. He therefore begged that they would ride slowly along the London road, when he would overtake them. Peters then departed, and Charles hurried to 'fit the horses.' As soon as this was done, they resumed their journey, and were rejoined by Wilmot and Peters about two miles from the town.

Charles was perhaps never in greater peril than on that afternoon. There was a muster for Jersey at all the surrounding ports, and the coast and the London road

swarmed with soldiers. Macey, moreover, was in hot pursuit behind, and reached the George Inn at Bridport only a quarter of an hour after the King had left it. If his inquiries there recalled the ostler's former acquaintance with Charles more accurately to his mind, the man kept his own counsel. But Macey learnt that the party he sought had taken the London road, and he dashed along it as far as Dorchester. The fugitives, meanwhile, quite unaware of the danger behind them, had come to the conclusion that the London road was too populous to be safe, and had turned off to the left towards Yeovil. Thus Macey missed his mark. At Dorchester he realised that he had lost the trail, and, retracing his steps, proceeded to search the neighbouring houses, among them that of Sir Hugh Wyndham, uncle to Francis, one of whose daughters the soldiers mistook for the King, and treated with great roughness.

All the time Charles was less than three miles away. At nightfall the royal party, having lost all bearings, halted at a village inn to ask for a drink and ascertain —incidentally—their whereabouts. But when the host came out and informed them that they were at Broadwindsor, the colonel recognised him as an old acquaintance and staunch Royalist. It was at once decided to stay the night there, and Wyndham begged the man to give them a private room, explaining that he and his brother-in-law, Colonel Bullen Reymes, whom Wilmot fortunately very much resembled, had transgressed the five-mile boundary. within which, as Royalists, they were confined, and would no doubt get into trouble if seen so far from home together.

The worthy host was full of sympathy, and willingly complied with the request. All were conducted to the top of the house, 'where privateness recompensed the meanness of the accommodation, and the pleasantness of the host—a merry fellow—allayed and mitigated the weariness of the guests.' The hostess also came up to welcome Colonel Reymes, her old friend. And the

affectionate greeting bestowed by her upon Wilmot afforded the King so much amusement that he still retained the memory of it many years later.[1] 1651

This little incident helped to revive the flagging spirits of the party, and all was going well when, to the dismay of every one, the constable led in forty soldiers, whom he insisted on billeting in the inn. The efforts of the host preserved the top room to those in possession, but they were, in a manner, imprisoned there, since they had no exit but through the midst of the soldiers who filled the lower rooms. Nor was this all. Soon after their arrival, one of the women who followed the camp gave birth to a child, and the parish officers came hastily to repudiate all responsibility, fearing lest the maintenance of the mother and child should be thrust on them. The rest of the night was made hideous by the brawls of the soldiers and villagers, which rendered sleep impossible. But the incident, though disagreeable, was fortunate, since it occupied the attention of the soldiers until day-break, when it was time for them to hasten to their ships, and effectually prevented them from showing any curiosity about their fellow-guests.[2]

The soldiers being gone, the fugitives were free to set out again on their wanderings, and it was decided that the King, with Wyndham and Juliana, should return to Trent. Wilmot, under the guidance of Peters, was to proceed to Salisbury, there to renew the quest for a ship. Peters was to serve as messenger between Trent and Salisbury, and, a cipher having been arranged, the company parted. Wilmot slept that night at Sherborne, where he was joined next morning by his faithful servant, Swan. Swan was the bearer of a message from Wyndham, to the effect that he had heard by chance that Colonel Robert Phelips of Montacute was living in Salisbury, and thought he might be useful in the September 24th-October 4th

[1] See *Fea*, p. 141.

[2] *Hughes*, pp. 154-5, 288-96, 322-9. *Fea*, pp. 257-60, 318. *Bates*, pp. 143-4.

1651 September 25th-October 5th

King's service.[1] Thus encouraged, Wilmot resumed his journey, and arrived the same day—September 25th—in Salisbury. He was conducted by Peters to an inn just outside the Cathedral Close, known as the King's Arms, and kept by a Royalist named Hewitt. This was a favourite resort of Cavaliers, and Frank Wyndham, having himself found timely refuge there upon occasion, deemed it a safe retreat for his friend. Immediately on his arrival Wilmot summoned to him John Coventry, a son of the late Lord Keeper, and 'a person noble, wise, and loyal,' who might, it was thought, possibly find the means of transportation for the King. Coventry came, and sent, in his turn, for Phelips, retiring, on the latter's arrival, to smoke with Hewitt. Wilmot then communicated his errand, concealing, at first, the name of the person for whom he sought help. But Phelips, who had already lost his estates, and was now living under a Parliamentary protection, feared to bring new trouble upon his family, and continued reserved and shy. Thus was Wilmot constrained at last to confess that it was the King himself for whom he asked succour, and thereupon the other thawed at once. He promised frankly to do his best in the cause, and, Coventry being recalled, the three drank 'a bottle or two' while Wilmot related the wonderful story of the King's adventures. On the same day Peters was despatched back to Trent with the comforting news that there was every hope of obtaining both a ship and the necessary funds through the efforts of Phelips and Coventry. Early next morning Phelips went to Southampton to seek out a merchant, named Horne, with whom he obtained an interview on Saturday, September 27th. Horne thought he knew a man who would take over Phelips's friends, and brought him to meet the colonel at Redbridge on Sunday afternoon. The interview was satisfactory, and the sailor agreed to undertake the job for the sum of £40, promising to have his boat ready on Wednesday, October 1st.

September 26th-October 6th

September 27th-October 7th

[1] *Fea*, p. 144. *Hughes*, p. 329.

1651
Sept. 24 – Oct. 5
Oct. 4 – Oct. 15

Phelips thereupon sent his brother Edward to Trent, to inform the King that all was ready; but, in the interim, the boat was pressed by the Government to carry provisions to Blake's fleet at Jersey, and the whole scheme fell through.

Phelips thought it unwise to make a second attempt at Southampton, especially as vessels sailing thence had to pass so many castles, and were frequently examined. He therefore returned to Salisbury, and, in consultation with Coventry and Dr. Henchman—afterwards Bishop of London—proposed to try some of the smaller ports along the Sussex coast. This idea was approved by the others, especially as Henchman knew a certain Colonel Gounter at Chichester, who might be able to assist them.[1]

In the meantime Charles had remained, closely concealed, at Trent. During all the time that he lay hid there—nineteen days—only one alarm disturbed the family, and that a false one. It was occasioned by the suspiciously quiet entrance of a troop of horse into Sherborne, witnessed by Mrs. Wyndham, who had gone out to seek news 'under the pretence of a visit.' Her fear was increased because her most diligent inquiries could elicit nothing of their errand or destination, and she returned home deeply perturbed. For a while she amused the King by repeating the vague rumours she had heard concerning himself. But he perceived the real disquietude beneath her 'vail of cheerfulness,' and insisted on being told its cause. When enlightened, he endeavoured to alleviate her anxiety by laughing 'most heartily'; yet she refused to be comforted, and made him retire to the secret room. All night she and her husband kept anxious watch, but morning brought relief, for, in the small hours, the soldiers marched for the coast, being bound, like the others, for Jersey. Nothing more occurred to disturb the general serenity. Charles occupied himself in cooking his own meals, 'for some divertisement of the time,' and in boring holes in coins.

[1] Fea, *Phelips's Account*, pp. 146-9, 262-3. *Bates*, pp. 146-7.

1651 These he gave, as mementos, to different members of the household, who 'thankfully treasured them up as the chiefest jewels of their family.'

He had resolved not to leave Trent until a ship was actually awaiting him, and therefore refused at first an invitation, brought by Henchman's chaplain, to the house of Mrs. Hyde at Heale, some six miles from Salisbury. But further messages convinced him, at last, that his continued presence at Trent was not conducive to his own or to the Wyndhams' safety, and he consented to leave them.

October 6th-16th On Sunday, October 5th, Robert Phelips arrived to escort him to Heale, and on Monday he took a grateful farewell of his friends, 'not omitting the meanest of those that served him.' But to old Lady Wyndham, whose proudest boast it was that she had lost three sons and one grandson in the service of her Sovereign, he showed a 'more than ordinary respect.' At ten o'clock in the morning he set out, riding with Juliana, as before, and attended by Phelips and Peters. Frank Wyndham would fain have accompanied him also, but his reiterated entreaties to be allowed to do so were absolutely refused.[1]

Passing through Wincanton, the travellers arrived, about midday, at Mere, on the borders of Wiltshire, and dined there at the George Inn. The host, Christopher Philips, whom Phelips knew to be 'perfectly honest,' sat down to drink with them and to discourse of the current topic, namely, the King's disappearance. He observed that the 'rebels' were in 'a great maze,' and had been diligently searching the houses in London, where it was believed he lay hid. At this Charles 'was observed to smile,' and the man turned to him, asking: 'Are you a friend to Cæsar?' Charles answered simply 'Yes,' whereupon the host poured out three glasses of wine, crying: 'Here's a health to King Charles!' The colonel and the disguised monarch drank to the toast, and the

[1] Hughes, *Mrs. Wyndham*, pp. 320, 330-3. *Blount*, p. 250.

incident dwelt in Charles's memory after the Restoration, when he made inquiry for 'the honest host at Mere.'[1] 1651

Parting with Peters and Juliana near Salisbury, the King, with Phelips, only reached Heale House at dusk. Their hostess, Mrs. Hyde, had been born a Tichborne, and was the widow of one of the Chancellor's cousins, but she had not, as yet, been informed of the rank of the refugee whom she had consented to receive. Once before, seven years earlier, she had seen the younger Charles when he marched through Salisbury with his father, and now she recognised him instantly as he alighted at her door. Being gifted with discretion, she made no sign, but welcomed him as a friend of Phelips, and led them both in to supper. Her sister, who lived with her, her brother-in-law, Frederick Hyde, and Dr. Henchman were present at the meal, and, during its progress, 'the good gentlewoman had much adoe to overcome herself.' She did violence to her feelings in not helping the King first, but she 'could not refrain from drinking a glass of wine to him, or from giving him two larks when others had but one.' Charles perceived that he was known, and took the first opportunity, after supper, to declare himself, not only to Mrs. Hyde, but also to her brother-in-law, who had expressed astonishment at the conversational gifts of one 'whose habit spoke him but of mean degree.'

The lady professed her willingness to take charge of his person, saying that she had a very safe hiding-place. She could not, however, trust her servants, and she therefore desired the King to depart openly with Phelips next morning, and return towards night, when she, having sent out all her servants, would admit him secretly at the back door. Charles then retired to his room, where he held long conference with Henchman ere he slept.

On the next morning Charles took a formal leave of Mrs. Hyde, as directed, and set out with Phelips, as though to continue his journey. All day the two rode about the Downs, counting and recounting the stones of October 7th-17th

[1] *Hughes*, p. 251.

1651 October 7th-17th

Stonehenge in order to pass the time, and Phelips records that 'the King's arithmetic gave the lie to the fabulous tale that those stones cannot be told twice alike.'

At evening they returned to Heale, and Phelips, having delivered up the King to Mrs. Hyde, departed with the horses to Newton Tony. Charles was taken in secretly, according to promise, and was concealed, as at Trent, in a private room, being waited upon exclusively by Mrs. Hyde and her sister. 'I went up into the hiding-hole, that was very safe and convenient,' he says, 'and staid there, all alone, some four or five days.'[1]

On the same night, Colonel Gounter, who had been temporarily released from his five-mile circuit, in order that he might raise money for a new fine imposed upon him by the Government, returned home between eight and nine o'clock in the evening. He was met in the hall by his wife, with the information that 'a Devonshire gentleman' was waiting in the parlour to see him, and, in some wonder, he retired to remove the stains of travel from his person. Entering the parlour a little later, he found his wife seated before the fire, between his cousin, Tom Gounter, and Lord Wilmot. The latter, seeing the recognition in his face, rose hastily to meet him, whispering: 'I see you know me. Do not own me.'

Gounter, wondering at his cousin's want of perception, 'for the noble lord was but meanly disguised,' took the hint, and merely called for a bottle of sack, 'which afforded some matter of discourse by reason of two wasps—or rather hornets—which came out at the opening.' Supper was then prepared under difficulties, for most of the servants were absent, and Swan came in to wait. As he passed his master he whispered to him that 'My Lord Wentworth's boy, Lonie, was without, and desired him to be careful, for fear the boy should know him.' The boy, as it chanced, had been found in distress by Tom Gounter and taken into his service as a charity.

[1] Hughes, *King's Account*, pp. 156-7. *Blount*, pp. 253-4.

Whether or no he recognised his former master's friend is not recorded, but Swan's whisper and her husband's manner aroused Mrs. Gounter's curiosity. After supper she began to murmur to her cousin that she was sure there was some mystery. He denied it, not having recognised Wilmot, which was strange, because he had once served under him, and within half an hour the colonel conducted Mr. Barlow, as the guest called himself, up to his bedroom. As soon as they were alone Wilmot said, with a heavy sigh: 'The King of England, my master, your master, and the master of all good Englishmen, is near you and in great distress. Can you help us to a boat?' For a few moments the colonel stood silent, gazing, in sad dismay, at his guest, but at last he asked: 'Is he well? Is he safe?'

'Yes,' returned Wilmot briefly.

'God be blessed!' sighed Gounter, and added that he could himself have provided an asylum, if need were. Then, returning to the question of the boat, he said seriously that 'for all he lived so near the sea, yet there was no man living so little acquainted with that kind of men as he was.' Nevertheless he was determined, some way or other, to perform what was asked of him. This resolute answer so delighted Wilmot that he seized upon his friend, 'hugging him in his arms and kissing his cheek again and again.' Gounter then retired, bidding Wilmot rest in security, 'for that he would watch while he slept.'

But, in his own room, he found his wife, wakeful and resolved to know who Wilmot was and what his business. He attempted to put her off, saying that 'it was nothing concerning her, or that would in any ways damnify her.' She retorted that it was 'enough, she doubted, to ruin him and all his family. And in that I am concerned,' she cried, breaking out into a very great passion of weeping.

The worthy colonel, completely vanquished by her tears, again took up his candle and sought Wilmot, to

1651 whom he explained the situation. He added that he could answer for his wife's loyalty, if Wilmot did not consider it 'anyway amiss to acquaint her with it.' Wilmot replied readily: 'No! no! By all means acquaint her with it.' And Gounter, greatly relieved, hastened to confide the great secret to his importunate wife. Thus satisfied, she dried her tears and said, smiling: 'Go on and prosper! Yet I fear you will hardly do it.' To which her husband responded bravely: 'I must endeavour and do my best, leaving the success to God.'

October 8th-18th In pursuance of this resolve, he rose early next morning and rode to Emsworth by the sea, with an old servant, John Day, who had relations among the sailors there. But, as it chanced, no boats were lying in the bay, and, much disappointed, they turned homewards. Wilmot had promised to await their report indoors, but they met him half a mile from the house, and he rode with them to Langstone, where Gounter went to make his next attempt. On the way Wilmot chanced to put his hand into his pocket and so discovered that the hundred gold pieces, confided to his care by the King, were missing. He then remembered that he had left his purse in bed, and Swan, returning to seek it, found that Mrs. Gounter had happily discovered it and taken it in charge. The expedition to Langstone was productive of nothing but oysters, and, after a feast of these, Wilmot and Gounter parted company. Wilmot now retired to the house of Laurence Hyde at Hinton Daubnay, and Gounter, having sent out his cousin, Tom Gounter, on the quest, followed Wilmot to Hinton that same evening. So bad was the weather that both Hyde and Wilmot besought him to stay the night, but he asserted that 'delays were dangerous,' and persisted in returning home. He reached his own house about two o'clock on the morning of Thursday, October 9th, and, after a couple of hours' rest, set out to seek his cousin at Chichester. There he learnt that Tom Gounter had been

no more successful than himself, yet, nothing daunted, he resolved to have recourse to a merchant, named Mansel, who had, he knew, some trade with France. His acquaintance with this man was of the slightest, and he went to him on the pretence of making a mere morning call. Mansel received him courteously, and entertained him with French wine and Spanish tobacco, until the colonel, encouraged by the merchant's affability, ventured to say that he had come to ask a favour of him. 1651 October 9th-19th

'Anything in my power!' returned Mansel readily.

Then said the colonel:

'Can you freight a bark? For I have two special friends of mine who have been engaged in a duel, and there is mischief done, and I must get them off if I can.'

Mansel replied that he could do what was desired at Brighthelmstone—or Brighton—in Sussex, then a mere fishing-village, and promised to accompany the colonel thither next day. They set out early on the following morning, and reached Brighton about two o'clock in the afternoon. There they learnt that Mansel's skipper, Nicholas Tattersal by name, had already left for Chichester, but had, by good-luck, put in at Shoreham. A message from Mansel brought him back to Brighton, on Saturday, October 11th, and there the merchant bargained with him on behalf of the supposed duellists. The sailor agreed to convey them to France for £60 paid down, and engaged to hold himself ready to sail at an hour's notice. Gounter thereupon promised to make good all expenses, and, leaving Mansel to watch over the boat and her captain, set out homewards. He reached Hinton at nine o'clock in the evening, only to find that Wilmot had removed thence to the house of a Mr. Anthony Brown. Robert Phelips was there, however, and both he and Laurence Hyde were eager to hear the news. Gounter told it, as briefly as he could, and Phelips exclaimed joyfully: 'Thou shalt be a saint in my almanac for ever!' October 10th-20th October 11th-21st

The weather was worse than before, but Gounter

1651 resisted all persuasions to stay the night, and insisted on seeking Wilmot without delay. Phelips accompanied him, and when Wilmot had sufficiently expressed his relief and satisfaction at the welcome tidings, it was agreed that Robert Phelips should go for the King. 'By reason that Colonel Gounter was much tired out, and would need rest for further employment.'[1]

October 12th-22nd Accordingly, on Sunday, October 12th, Phelips came to Heale, and informed the King that a boat awaited him at Shoreham. No time was to be lost, and, at two

October 13th-23rd o'clock on Monday morning, Charles sallied forth on foot, attended by Dr. Henchman. Some two miles from Heale, Phelips awaited them with the horses. One of these had given him 'no small trouble' by breaking its bridle and bolting up the river, but he had succeeded in recapturing it, and in mending the bridle 'after some tolerable manner.' This done, he started, with the King, for Brighton.[2]

On the afternoon of the same day, Wilmot, Swan, and the two Gounters had gone out coursing on the Downs near Warnford, with greyhounds borrowed of Mrs. Symons, George Gounter's sister, who lived at Hambledon, near Hinton Daubnay. After some hours' sport, George Gounter left the others and rode to meet the King, whom he encountered close to Warnford. Being so near the town, he judged it best to take no notice, but rode by, and entering an inn, sat there for a while, smoking and drinking beer. When at last he thought that the fugitives must have made a safe distance, he followed and overtook them; after which they were soon joined by Wilmot and the rest. Charles then asked: 'Canst thou get me a lodging hereabouts?'

Gounter replied that Laurence Hyde was ready to receive him, but Charles deemed his house too well known, and asked again: 'Know you no other?'

[1] *Gounter's Narrative*, Fea, pp. 281-93. Cary's *Memorials*, II. pp. 431-42.

[2] *Phelips's Account*, Fea, p. 167.

'Yes,' returned Gounter; 'I know divers yeomanry men where, for a night, we may be welcome, and here is one who married my sister, whose house stands privately out of the way.'

'Let us go thither!' said the King.

Therefore, while Swan and Tom Gounter rode 'scouting about,' George Gounter led Charles, Wilmot, and Phelips to his sister's house, which they reached 'about candle-lighting.' Gounter entered first, Wilmot next, and the King, seeing Phelips hesitate, thrust him before him, saying: 'Thou lookest most like a gentleman now.' The lady of the house came forward to meet them, led them into a little parlour, where a good fire was burning, and set wine, ale, and biscuits before them. About an hour later all went to supper, sitting promiscuously at a round table, and when they were half done, in came Tom Symons, the master of the house. He had plainly 'been in company,' and the sight of the strangers at his table vexed his confused mind.

'This is brave!' he exclaimed sarcastically. 'A man can no sooner be out of the way but his house must be taken up with I know not whom!'

Then, recognising his brother-in-law, he added, in a mollified tone: 'Oh, is it you? *You* are welcome, and —as your friends—so are they all!'

Passing round the table, he looked at his uninvited guests, observing: 'These are all Hydes!' But by the King he paused, and, gazing into his face, exclaimed:

'Here is a Roundhead! I never knew you to keep Roundheads' company before.'

'It is no matter! He is my friend and, I assure you, no dangerous man,' replied George Gounter.

Symons thereupon sat down by the King, to make amends for his mistrust, and shaking his hand heartily, assured him: 'Brother Roundhead, for his sake thou art welcome.'

'The King, delighted with the mistake, skilfully played the part assigned to him, and when Symons slipped out

1651 an oath, reproved him gravely with: 'Oh, dear brother, that is a scape! Swear not, I beseech thee.'

Yet Charles soon found the attentions of his host overwhelming, for he dared not refuse the 'strong waters' and beer continually offered him, but could not drink them. He solved the difficulty, however, by deftly passing his glass to some other member of the company whenever Symons looked away; and at last Gounter, remembering that Charles and Phelips had ridden forty miles, and would have to make an early start next day, bethought him of getting them to bed. He whispered to Symons: 'He is a Roundhead, indeed, and if we could get him to bed, the house were our own, and we could be merry.' Symons welcomed the suggestion, and suffered his brother-in-law to conduct the King and Phelips to the room assigned them for the night.

October 14th-24th Very early next morning, Tuesday, October 14th, Charles dismissed Phelips with all due thanks for his services, and set out on his journey with Wilmot, Swan, and the two Gounters. At Stanstead, in Sussex, Tom Gounter also turned back, lest the numbers of the party should attract attention, for the route was perilous, and the journey was not without adventure. Near Arundel Castle they encountered the governor, Colonel Morley, 'full butt,' hunting, and Gounter thought it safest to alight while he passed. Charles observed his enemy with interest, and remarked gaily: 'I did not much like his starched mouchates.' At Houghton they halted at an inn door and called for bread and beer, while they ate a couple of 'neat's tongues' brought by Gounter from his sister's house. Some miles further on, between three and four in the afternoon, they again encountered soldiers, this time a troop of forty, who had come from their guard on Bramber Bridge to refresh themselves in the village. Wilmot, with unusual caution, would feign have turned back, but Gounter urged a bold front. Charles supported Gounter, remarking: 'He saith well!' and the party rode through the midst of their foes unhindered. They had

not gone far when they were alarmed by the same troop riding after them at a rapid pace. Gounter's natural impulse was to urge his horse forward, but Charles's warning cough bade him slacken speed. The soldiers, therefore, overtook them, and crowded roughly through the lane, nearly jostling the travellers out of their saddles, but taking no notice of them.

At Beeding Gounter had provided 'a treatment' for the King, at the house of a Mr. Bagshall, where he wished Charles to stay while he reconnoitred the coast. But Wilmot, who had grown strangely nervous, would not suffer it, and took the King away from the high-road, promising to seek out Gounter later at the George Inn at Brighton. Thither the colonel repaired, took the best room, and ordered supper for himself. He had not sat there long when the host—one Smith—was heard ushering another party into the adjoining room. 'More guests!' he observed, looking in on Gounter. And a moment later came the King's voice, saying very distinctly: 'Mr. Barlow, I drink to you.'

'I know that name,' cried Gounter, addressing the host quickly: 'I pray inquire whether he was not a major in the King's army.' The inquiry produced, of course, an assent from Wilmot, and an invitation to join him in the next room. Gounter feigned to be about to do so, and then—as an afterthought—suggested that his own room, being larger, would better accommodate the company. Wilmot and Charles thereupon came in, and the party was reunited.[1]

At supper they were joined by Mansel and Tattersal, and throughout the meal Charles was in the highest spirits, notwithstanding the steady stare fixed upon him by the sailor. Shortly afterwards, as Charles stood with his back to the fire, leaning over a chair, the host came up and began to talk to him. The rest of the company retired momentarily into the adjoining room, and the

[1] Fea, *Gounter's Account*, pp. 295-9. Hughes, *King's Account*, p. 158, Cary's *Memorials*, ii. pp. 442-8.

man, perceiving that they were alone, bent suddenly to kiss the King's hand, saying:

'God bless you wheresoever you go! I do not doubt but, before I die, to be a lord and my wife a lady!'

'So I laughed,' says Charles, 'and went away into the next room, not desiring then any discourse with him; there being no remedy against my being known by him, and more discourse might but have raised suspicion.'

Gounter, however, was appalled, and seized the first opportunity to pour out his deep regret for the occurrence, and his protests that he had done nothing to betray the secret. Charles answered lightly: 'Peace! Peace! Colonel,' he said. 'The fellow knows me, and I him. He was one that belonged to my father, to the back stairs. I hope he is an honest fellow!'

In the meantime Tattersal had drawn Mansel aside and reproached him for unfair dealing.

'For,' said he, 'it is the King, and I very well know him to be so.'

Mansel was really ignorant of the fact, and denied it, but Tattersal persisted:

'I know him very well, for he took my ship, with other vessels, at Brighthelmstone, in the year 1648.'

'Which,' explains Charles, 'was when I commanded my father's fleet, and I very kindly let them go again.'[1]

This 'kindness' had caused much heartburning among his followers at the time, but it now had its reward, and, very probably, saved Charles's life. Tattersal resolved to risk all to land him safely in France, yet knowing the danger and the importance of the business, he did not disdain to attempt to better his bargain. In view of the risk, he now required Gounter to insure the boat for £200. This, after some dispute, was agreed on, and he then demanded Gounter's bond upon it. But the colonel could endure no further, and sharply refused it, remarking that there were other boats to be had. The King then interposed with:

[1] See above, pp. 52-3, 63.

'He saith right. A gentleman's word is as good as his bond—especially before witnesses,' he concluded, rather cynically. 1651

Tattersal was appeased, and changing his front suddenly, vowed that 'carry them he would, whatsoever came of it; and before he would be taken he would run his boat under water.'

Presently Charles opened the window and observed that the wind, heretofore against them, had now veered round. Gounter thereupon offered Tattersal an extra £10 to start at once. But this proved impossible, for the man had brought his boat for safety into a narrow creek, and there she lay grounded until the tide should rise. He agreed, however, to take the King on board before daylight, and for some hours they all sat up, 'drinking beer and taking tobacco with him,' lest he should go home and fall into the hands of his wife as Limbry had done.

At last, however, they were obliged to let him go, to make his preparations. The King and Wilmot lay down to take an hour's rest, in their clothes, and Tattersal went to seek his men. He knocked them up and bade them hasten to the half-loaded brig at Shoreham on the pretext that she had slipped her anchor and was drifting. Then he went to his house and demanded, like Limbry, clean linen and a bottle of brandy. His wife was astonished.

'But why so late at night?' she queried.

He protested eagerly that he could brook no delay.

'It's the King!' cried the woman, noting his ill-suppressed excitement; 'pray God you carry him safe!'

And she suffered him to return, unhindered, to the inn. October 15th-25th
At two o'clock on Wednesday morning Gounter called up the King and Wilmot. The horses had been conveyed secretly to the shore—doubtless by the invaluable Swan—and having mounted, they rode along the beach to the creek at Shoreham, where the coal-brig lay. Then the faithful colonel begged his Sovereign, as the only

favour he asked of him, to keep secret the names of all who had aided him. This promise Charles made and faithfully kept. Also he paid the money to Mansel and Tattersal, for which Gounter had pledged his own credit. With many words of grateful thanks, he took his leave of his loyal subject, and followed Wilmot up the ladder at the ship's side. Till late in the afternoon Gounter remained with the horses on the shore, in case of accident, and only when the ship was out of sight did he turn homeward. He records that he had not left the town two hours when soldiers entered it to search for 'a tall, black man, six feet two inches high.'[1]

As soon as they had entered the ship, Wilmot and Charles retired to the little cabin, and thither Tattersal immediately followed them. Falling on his knees, he kissed Charles's hand, and told him that he 'knew him well and would venture all he had in the world to set him safe in France.' About seven or eight o'clock the tide came up, and they set sail. Tattersal had given out that he was bound, with coal, for Poole, and so stood away in that direction until they were out of sight from land, which was not for many hours. There remained one more little comedy to be played. Tattersal begged the King to avert the suspicion of the crew by asking them to persuade their captain to sail for France, and to this Charles assented.

Addressing himself to the crew, four men and a boy, he told them a tale like that invented by Limbry, to the effect that he and his friend were distressed merchants, fleeing from their creditors, but with money owing to them in France. He begged them, therefore, to induce their master to sail for the French coast, and clinched his arguments with the gift of twenty shillings. The men promised to second his petition to the captain, and all approached Tattersal, to whom Charles repeated his tale. Tattersal refused at first to comply with his

[1] Hughes, *King's Account*, pp. 159-61. Fea, *Gounter's Account*, pp. 299-303. Cary's *Memorials*, ii. pp. 448-52.

request, saying that it would be a loss to him to go out of his course. The men, however, added their voices to the King's, and the master feigned, at last, a reluctant consent. Thus, about five in the evening, they took their course for France. Charles amused himself by sailing the vessel, to the amazement of the captain, 'who wondered that his Majesty understood their course better than he himself did.' While he was thus engaged, a sailor stood smoking in Charles's face, whereupon Tattersal bade him, rather sharply, to move away and 'not trouble the gentleman with his smoke.' The man retired with the apt, but quite unconscious retort that 'A cat may look at a king.' 1651

Next morning, October 16th, they sighted the coast of France, but the wind failing suddenly, they were obliged to drop anchor about two miles from Fécamp. While they waited for the tide, Charles observed a distant vessel which he took for an Ostend privateer. Confiding his opinion to Wilmot, he proposed to go ashore at once in the cock-boat, lest the Spanish vessel should seize them, as bound for a French port. Tattersal had arrived at the same conclusion, and came to warn the King, whereupon Charles and Wilmot entered the little boat and landed at Fécamp, being carried ashore on the shoulders of the men. October 16th-26th

Almost immediately after this the wind changed, and Tattersal was enabled to reach Poole the same night, before any one suspected that he had been elsewhere.

Next morning Charles and Wilmot rode to Rouen, and sought quarters at an inn in the Fish Market, but they found that their disreputable appearance excited no small suspicion in the people of the house. 'They made difficulty to receive us,' says Charles, 'taking us, by our clothes, to be some thieves, or persons that had done some very evil thing.' At last, irked by the close watch kept upon him, the King bethought him of sending for an English merchant, a Mr. Sandbourne, resident in the town, to vouch for his respectability. Sandbourne came October 17th-27th

1651 October 18th-28th promptly, and with the help of another merchant, named Parker, soon supplied Charles with a new outfit. His old clothes they divided between them, 'to be kept as holy relics.'[1]

It is said that before this transformation had been effected, Dr. Earles, hurrying to welcome his former pupil, met him on the stairs, and, taking him for a servant of the house, bade him lead him to the King.

When the report of the lost monarch's return was spread abroad, another merchant, Mr. Scott, came to offer the loan of his house, and there Charles remained, while notice of his escape was sent to the Queen-Mother.

October 19th-29th October 20th-30th At last, on October 19th, he hired a coach and set out, with Wilmot, for Paris. They slept that night at Fleury, and proceeded next day to Moriceaux, where Queen Henrietta, James of York, the Duc d'Orléans, and a large company of nobles, French and English, awaited them. By these Charles was conducted in triumph to Paris, and late on the night of Thursday, October 20th he entered the Louvre, where—for a while at least—his wanderings ended.

His return, and the account that he gave of his adventures, are thus described by Morosini, the Venetian ambassador at Paris: 'The King of England entered Paris on Wednesday evening (*sic*), having been met by the Queen his mother, the Duke of York, and by many others of the grandees of the Court besides. His retinue consisted of one gentleman and one varlet, and his costume was more calculated to induce laughter than respect; his appearance, in short, being so changed, that the outriders who first came up with him, thought he must be one of his own menials.

'He narrates that he made his escape, after the last battle, with one gentleman and one soldier, which last, having passed the greater part of his life as a highway-

[1] Hughes, *King's Account*, pp. 161-3. Fea, Tract iii. p. 264-7. *Bates*, pp. 148-51.

man, was very familiar with the byways. Travelling 1651
with these companions by night, and always on foot, he reached the extremity of Scotland, where, as there was neither any ship, nor the means of obtaining safety, he had himself completely shorn, to disguise himself as much as possible. He returned to England, where, as ill-luck would have it, he was recognised by a miller, who commenced shouting in order to raise the country to his seizure. But, although he lacked the external attributes of royalty, he displayed both prudence and courage in completely extricating himself from so perilous a predicament. Hastening to a wood, he climbed a tree, and hid himself among the leaves of its wide-spread branches. Although the country-people likewise were densely spread, far and wide, they, at any rate, never thought of lifting up their eyes, despite the wood being crowded with people in quest of him. So, at night, he went on his way towards London, which he entered without being recognised. There he remained in the same disguise, lodged in the house of a certain woman who got him a passage. To avoid any risk in quitting London, he wore her clothes, and, with a basket on his head, got down in safety to the water-side, and there continued his voyage.'[1]

In relating his story to the Queen, Charles dwelt at some length on the part played by the 'moss-trooper' or highwayman, who, he said, 'quaked and shaked so much,' while they sat in the oak-tree, that he feared lest the shaking of the branches should betray them, and the various tales with which he amused both himself and the Court, certainly do credit to his powers of invention.[2]

'Since the King of Scots his arrival here, we have had so many odd stories reported of him, that it would suffice to make a very pretty romance,' wrote an English

[1] *Venetian Transcripts*, Record Office. Morosini to the Doge, 7th November 1651. Eng. transl. 1645-53, cxxii. fol. 34.

[2] *Harleian MSS.* cmxci. fol. 90. Lady Wood's Account, 'she having heard the King tell it to his mother.'

spy in Paris. 'Nothing can be certain from his mouth, for he still refuseth, even to his own mother, to discover the names and qualities of those who concealed him, and got him away out of England. But for the satisfaction of those who importune him, he tells them some tale or another, to which every one adds what he thinks best.'[1]

Thus it was that Charles kept his promise of secrecy, and the true history of his wanderings never passed his lips until many years later, when he was actually on board the vessel that conveyed him homeward to an expectant and enthusiastically loyal England.[2]

But, though silent, he was not forgetful, and almost every person who had aided him in his need received, in due time, some reward or mark of gratitude. Those bestowed upon the Penderels, Whitgreaves, Lanes and Wyndhams have been already mentioned. To Colonel Carlos and the Giffards was granted an immunity from the recusancy laws, together with certain pensions. Carlos received also an honourable augmentation of his arms, and the gift of a sword from the King. The Wolfes declined the pension offered to them, but accepted the addition of a royal crown to their arms, and a service of plate emblazoned with the same. On the Symons Charles bestowed a punch-bowl with ladle and cups, in memory of the night when they had entertained him unawares. The Gounters received a pension, and in addition to this, Charles undertook the education of their eldest son, whom he sent to Winchester and New College, Oxford. Robert Phelips became a groom of the Bedchamber and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, receiving besides a pension of £400 a year. Mansel had a pension of £200, Tattersal a still smaller one, and the gift of a ring. But the little boat that had carried the King to safety was entered in the royal navy, with her own skipper in command, and her name changed from

[1] *Mercurius Politicus*, $\frac{25\text{th October}}{4\text{th November}}$ 1651.

[2] Pepys's *Diary*, 23rd May 1660.

The Surprise to *The Royal Escape*. Even her crew were remembered, and several Quakers were released from prison on the petition of the mate, who himself belonged to that 'Society.'

Ellesdon's reward was long deferred, for Limbry endeavoured to throw the blame of failure upon him, and, for a while, his loyalty was doubted. But the testimony of Frank Wyndham, that he had acted in good faith and loyal intention, was at last accepted, and the merchant received a pension of £100 a year. It must be confessed that the pensions so freely granted were not invariably paid with such regularity as might have been desired, but for that the King himself was not, perhaps, wholly to blame.[1]

[1] *Fea*, pp. 34, 57, 140, 172-5, 185-7, 346. Hughes's *Boscobel*, pp. 75-86, 339-47. Symonds's *Diary*, *Harleian MSS.*, cmxci. fol. 90. *Mercurius Politicus*, 2nd Nov. 1651.

CHAPTER XII

The State of Europe in 1650—Embassies sent by Charles to Persia and Morocco—To Poland—To Moscow—To Madrid—The Journey of Hyde and Cottington—Their Reception in Spain—The Murder of Ascham—Rupert on the Spanish Coast—The Recognition of the Commonwealth by Spain—The Dismissal of Charles's Ambassadors—The Mission of Meynell at Rome—The State of Ireland—The Treaty with Charles IV. of Lorraine.

1650-1651 THROUGHOUT the years 1650 and 1651 the position of the Royalists abroad had become daily more uncomfortable. Charles's cause prospered even less in his absence than in his presence; the lives of his exiled subjects grew always harder, and his ambassadors were but coldly received in the deeply embarrassed Courts of Europe.

France and Spain were, as has been seen, sufficiently occupied in their mutual struggle, by which both were impoverished and exhausted. The Empire, at rest since the Peace of Westphalia, concluded on the 22nd of October 1648, needed time to recruit after the thirty years' warfare. Poland was harassed by the Cossacks, and Charles's most faithful friend, William of Orange, was engaged in a fierce conflict with the republican states of Holland, wherein he lost both prestige and popularity.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, Charles had not relinquished the hope of wringing some monetary support at least from the impoverished nations, and it was with this view that he had despatched Hyde and Cottington to Madrid, Robert Meynell to Rome, William Crofts to

Poland, Culpepper to Moscow, and Henry Bard, Viscount Bellamont, to Persia and Morocco. 1650

Bellamont's instructions were to relate the whole history of the English rebellion, particularly emphasising the seizure, by the rebels, of the royal revenues, lands, and palaces, to assure the two 'Emperors' to whom he was accredited, that the King had still considerable forces under his command, and to request a loan of money, for the repayment of which he was to pledge the King's word. It would have been curious to learn the kind of reception accorded to Charles's envoy by the Eastern potentates, but the unfortunate ambassador perished in a sandstorm, and the appeal with which he was charged was never made.[1]

Crofts journeyed to Poland with more success, and was fortunate in obtaining a small sum of money from the King and Queen, who were full of kind words, and regrets that their own troubles rendered it impossible for them to help Charles more effectually.

Culpepper also was well received in Moscow. Though May his lodgings were barely 'tolerable,' and his food 'coarse,' that was due to the uncivilised conditions of the country, and not to any lack of goodwill on the part of the Czar, Alexis. He welcomed the ambassador ceremoniously on Sunday, May the 5th, 1650, spoke warmly of his 'brother,' King Charles, and promised all the assistance in his power. A dinner consisting of a hundred dishes was then sent to Culpepper's lodgings, and during his stay he received a daily provision of one sheep, four hens, a quarter of beef, and a side of bacon, with bread, beer, mead, wood, and water at his will. Free post was also granted to him for a distance of seven hundred miles.

The committee of nobles appointed to treat with him wearied him by reciting their titles for the space of two hours, but when they at last turned to business, they readily acceded to all his requests. His visit lasted a

[1] *Carte MSS.*, cxxx. fol. 144.

month, and at its conclusion he departed with 20,000 roubles for the King, and sables, to the value of £130, for himself, besides other furs which were bestowed upon his servants.[1]

1649 May Very different was the reception accorded to Hyde and Cottington at Madrid. They had been instructed to raise a loan in Spain, and to make a close alliance with the Spanish Crown, promising—in return for present help—the suspension and, if possible, the repeal of all penal laws affecting the religious liberty of Charles's Roman Catholic subjects. Further, they were bidden to conciliate the Papal Nuncio by any means in their power.[2]

But, though the sympathies of Spain were with the King, policy inclined her to the Commonwealth; the presence of Charles's ambassadors was not desired, and the Spanish ministers were directed to stop them at Brussels.

Accordingly, when they arrived there in May 1649, they were met by Pignoranda and Fuensaldagna, who discoursed to them at large of the poverty of Spain, and the absolute impossibility of her doing anything for the exiled King. But the ambassadors refused to be daunted. They obtained from the Archduke Leopold a courteous, but formal, promise of his intercession with Philip IV., and from the Duke of Lorraine, by Cottington's 'dexterity,' the gift of 2000 pistoles, and with this scant encouragement they proceeded to Madrid.

October At Irun they were examined by an inquisitor 'of a large size, and a very barbarous aspect and behaviour,' but he was easily pacified with a list of their books, and 'a piece of eight,' which he received 'very thankfully.' At San Sebastian they encountered more serious obstacles. Letters from Sir Benjamin Wright, an English merchant, resident at Madrid, informed them that no house had been prepared for their reception, and they found that the Governor of the place had received orders

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 182-5. *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 311.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxvii. fol. 118.

to detain them until further notice. Worse still, they were addressed merely as the Ambassadors of the 'Prince of Wales.' 1649 November

Yet even this failed to alter their determination to proceed, and a firm demand for an explanation produced apologies from the Court, and leave to continue their journey. Towards the end of November 1649 they reached Madrid, and took up their abode in the house of Sir Benjamin Wright. The rest of the train found quarters where they could.

At first the Court ignored their arrival, but Cottington at last obtained an audience in the palace garden with Don Luis de Haro, the favourite and chief minister. Then Spanish politeness triumphed over Spanish policy. Don Luis deeply regretted 'the mistakes' that had occurred, and promised that all should be rectified when the festivities consequent on the King's recent marriage were over. In the interim he invited the English strangers to a masquerade and a bull-fight. They went and were duly impressed, though they considered the spectacle 'barbarous.' They were also present at a tilting at the ring, in which the King himself carried off the honours, and Hyde observed that Don Luis 'was too good a courtier to win any prize, though he always lost it by very little.' December

The grave courtesy of the favourite had made a good impression on the two ambassadors. Even Cottington —albeit not easily deceived—believed in his sincerity, and Hyde wrote of him warmly:—

'The favourite here is a right worthy person, and hath the most generous sense of our master's condition and misfortunes that I have met in any man. And though he hath not the kind of air that our favourites and great courtiers used to have, (he hath) a civility most proper and applicable to business, without any other pomp of words than what is necessary to let you see he means very well.'[1]

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xxxix. fol. 62.

1649 December 22nd N.S.

Further encouragement was derived from the courtesy of the foreign ambassadors resident at Madrid. These, contrary to custom, all visited the English envoys privately before they had obtained audience of the King. Even the Papal Nuncio, who could not personally visit the representatives of a heretic Sovereign, sent civil messages and assurances of his goodwill by the Venetian ambassador.

Not until December the 22nd were Hyde and Cottington received by the King. Early on that morning Don Luis sent horses to their door, and, mounted on these, they rode to their audience, followed by the coaches of all the embassies, and accompanied by many English merchants and Irish officers in addition to their own train. They reached the palace at ten o'clock, and passing through a long suite of rooms, found the King, standing with his back against the wall, at some distance from his grandees, who maintained the same position. Moving his hat, Philip bade them cover, and listened patiently to Cottington's assurances of Charles's reliance on his generosity and friendship. The ambassadors then presented their credentials, with a paper containing an account of Charles's condition. Finally they begged for Philip's alliance, and for his mediation with the Pope, the Catholic Princes, and the Irish leader, Owen O'Neil. In return they offered Charles's 'entire affection and alliance,' and promised large concessions to his Roman Catholic subjects.[1]

Philip delivered, in reply, 'a pathetical discourse' about the death of Charles I., declaring his desire to avenge 'the murder,' and his 'tender sense' of the young King's position. For the present, he said, 'his hands were full,' but when he had peace with France, he would actively assist his English nephew.[2] Meantime he would intimate to Owen O'Neil—Don Eugenio he called him—that his adhesion to the King would gratify Spain. He could

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 504-6.

[2] Philip IV.'s first wife was Henrietta Maria's sister, Elisabeth of France.

not, however, write to O'Neil direct, because the Irish champion had quitted the Spanish service without leave or licence. Then, business being concluded, Philip began to talk eagerly of his sister, the Queen-Regent of France, and detained the ambassadors long in conversation. 1650 January-May

After this a house was provided for them, well furnished as regarded the State apartments, but lacking beds and other necessaries. Beds were, however, hired; a kitchen was constructed in the stables, and the ambassadors devoted themselves seriously to their negotiations. Money they soon found was not to be hoped for, nor could they obtain the freedom of the ports for Rupert's fleet. Don Luis was 'very civil, but shy of engaging the Crown.' Until France and Holland made the same concession, he dared not expose Spain 'to the fury of the Parliament.'

Moreover, the ambassadors were discouraged and hampered by lack of news from the King, and for a long time they sought no more audiences.

In May they learnt that Charles was going to Scotland, and, though the news filled both with dismay, it produced a favourable change in their treatment. They became again persons of consequence, yet they could not prevent the reception of an English envoy at Madrid. May

The Parliament had become anxious about the Royalist mission, and accordingly despatched to Spain an envoy of its own, one Anthony Ascham, a scholar who had been concerned in the late King's trial, and who had subsequently published a book justifying the regicide. He reached Madrid on May 26th, 1650, and there he was speedily overtaken by the fate of Dorislaus.

On the night of his arrival, his Spanish escort established him at 'a common inn, without locks or bolts,' and there left him, declaring their duty towards him to be fully accomplished. Ascham, being quite aware of his own danger, was greatly perturbed by this supineness, and, on the following morning, he sent to demand a guard of the Spanish Court. The King was at Mass, and the request was therefore delayed; but an answer

1650 May was at last returned that the desired guard should be sent within an hour. The British envoy, thus reassured, sent out his secretary, George Fisher, to seek better lodgings, and himself sat down to dinner about noon with a renegade friar, who acted as his interpreter.

Presently there entered the inn six young English Cavaliers, five of whom were soldiers of the Spanish army. Two mounted guard at the inn door, two halted at the door of Ascham's room, and two entering bowed ceremoniously. Ascham rose from his seat and was instantly cut down by the sword of Captain John Williams, the foremost of the party. The friar, seeking flight, was killed in mistake at the door; but the footman, who made no attempt to escape, was left unhurt. The five soldiers then sought sanctuary in the neighbouring church of St. Andra. The sixth member of the party, Henry Progers, who belonged to the train of Charles's ambassadors, was received and sheltered by the Venetian Embassy until he could escape to France.

Hyde and Cottington were just entering their coach 'to take the air' when the news of what had occurred reached them. Dismay seized them, not because they disapproved the deed in itself—that was, in their eyes, a mere act of justice—but because they feared the probable results of so flagrant a breach of the peace in a foreign land. Returning to the house they wrote hastily to Don Luis, disclaiming all share in the transaction. Don Luis, with the fear of England before his eyes, answered but coldly, and ordered the arrest of the murderers. They were taken from their refuge, 'protesting in the Spanish tongue, not well pronounced, that they stood upon the immunity of the Church,' and had performed 'an heroical and lawful action' in slaying 'an enemy of God, their King, and their country.'[1]

[1] *Spanish Letters and Papers*, Record Office, xliii. Laurence Chambers to Council of the State, 31st August 1650. *Thurloe State Papers*, i. pp. 148-51. George Fisher to the Council of State, 9th, 10th June 1650. *Carte MSS.*, cxxx. fol. 221, 224.

This was the Spanish opinion; and a mob, eager to testify its sympathy and approval, speedily collected about the English Embassy. Nor were the foreign ambassadors less sympathetic than the Spaniards. They hastened to offer their support to their English brethren, and to consult with them as to the best means of saving 'those unhappy gentlemen who had involved themselves, by their rashness, in so much peril.' The Papal Nuncio was especially loud in his protests against the violation of the privilege of sanctuary, and Don Luis was placed in an awkward dilemma. In reality he shared the generally favourable view of the affair, and he once permitted himself to say to Hyde: 'I envy those gentlemen for having done so noble an action to avenge the blood of their King, how penal soever it may prove to them.' He feared also the censures of the Church; but, in the then weak and necessitous condition of Spain, he feared even more the enmity of the English Commonwealth, which sent reiterated demands for justice. 1650 May

The matter remained in abeyance for several months, the hapless prisoners being kept the while in fetters; but in January 1651, when Hyde and Cottington had left Madrid, they were at last brought to trial and condemned to death. The execution did not take place, however, and finally Church and State agreed upon a compromise. The prisoners were restored to their sanctuary, whence all but one, William Sparkes, succeeded in making their escape. Sparkes was taken and subsequently executed, protesting to the last his sincere belief in the righteousness of his deed. 1651 January

'I aspire higher—to speak a proud word—than this world, or a mortal payment, namely to the glorie of doing well,' he wrote in his last days. 'Satis mihi fructus in ipsa conscientia pulcherrimi facti. It is the thought of this, next God, that hath kept me alive, and protracted my miserable life through these extremities past, for I thought alwaies that I should die with farre

more honour than the best of my ennemies could live.'[1]

1650 November

The appearance of Rupert's fleet on the Spanish coast in 1650 wrought a temporary change in the position of Charles's ambassadors. The governors of the ports were hastily warned to treat the Royalist vessels well. Don Luis received the ambassadors 'with open arms,' and took care that they had daily 'visits and caresses from the Court and from those in authority.' But this period of sunshine was brief. Blake came in pursuit of Rupert with a large Parliamentary fleet, and the Royalists were forced to take refuge in the Tagus. To be a friend of Portugal was to be the enemy of Spain.[2] The Spaniards froze at once, and the English ambassadors could obtain no redress for the ill-treatment of some of Rupert's sailors who were wrecked on the rocks of Carthagena.

Ascham's secretary, George Fisher, had remained meanwhile in Madrid, dwelling in daily terror of his life, and scarcely daring to cross his threshold, for fear of the English, Irish, and Scottish Royalists, whom he described as 'so desperate and resolute that they valew not their own lives so they may mischiefe one that hath relation to the Parliament which is equally hateful to the Spaniards.'[3]

The civilities of the Spanish Court had not blinded Fisher to its real sentiments; and, though he did not doubt his success in the mission that had devolved upon him, through his master's death, he saw very clearly that circumstances, and not inclination, were forcing Philip IV. to ally himself with the English Parliament rather than with the English King.

'I have now, at last, perceived that this King's respect unto me hath been out of fear and not out of love to the Parliament,' he wrote to the Council of State in April 1651; 'for I plainly see that they doe extreamly hate

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 165; xlviii. fol. 30. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. 217.

[2] Portugal revolted from Spain 15th December 1640.

[3] *Thurloe*, i. p. 152.

us, but seem to respect us for their own ends. But they have so much need of our friendship that I am confident we may bring them to any conditions we please.'[1] 1650 December

His judgment was correct. The commercial interests of Spain made the hostility of England a thing to be feared. Moreover, Philip dared not risk the chance of her alliance with France, and the Stuarts were the relations and *protégés* of his Bourbon foes. Cromwell's victory at Dunbar, and the continued presence of Blake's fleet on the Spanish coasts, decided the Spanish King's course of action, and on December 26th, 1650, he made his formal recognition of the English Commonwealth through his ambassador in London.

It was then necessary to dismiss Charles's ambassadors, and they were informed that their retirement would greatly advance the welfare of Spain. Deeply offended by so 'unusual' a message, they demanded an audience of Don Luis, who insisted on their departure, but softened the discourtesy by promising the secret payment of a sum of money, '50,000 pieces of eight,' to Charles in Flanders. The ambassadors, objecting to travel in January, still lingered, until the King sent word that he had fixed a day to take leave of them. Hyde wished to resent this by refusing the 'present' offered to him, but Cottington persuaded him to take a peaceable leave of the Court; and, on the 6th of March, they quitted Madrid. 1651 January-March

Cottington, who desired to end his days in Spain, where he had passed his youth, had reconciled himself to the Church of Rome, and had obtained from King Philip leave to reside at Valladolid, and a promise to provide for his support 'as his necessities required.'

Hyde, after visiting the Queen at Paris, went to his own family in Antwerp, where he found that the Archduke had been instructed to treat him with courtesy, as an ambassador and the personal friend of Don Luis. 'Which ceremonies,' says Hyde, 'though they cost them

[1] *Spanish Letters*, Record Office, xliii., 4th April 1651.

1649 September nothing, brought real benefit to the ambassador—*i.e.* himself.'[1]

Robert Meynell, though at first well received at Rome, had fared, in the event, no better than the ambassadors at Madrid.

His instructions were to obtain the Pope's aid in uniting Ireland for the King, and also, if possible, a gift or loan of money; promising, in return, religious liberty for the Irish, and the restoration of all their confiscated rights and lands, lay or ecclesiastical. He was also to assure the Holy Father of the King's esteem and 'good affection.'

Meynell arrived in Rome towards the end of September 1649, and found there Father Rowe, a Cistercian monk who had been endeavouring for seven months past to obtain the absolution of the Irish Confederates whom Rinnucini had excommunicated for joining Ormonde in 1648. His efforts had been frustrated, however, by another priest, Father Crelly, who was engaged in a counter-intrigue for a union of Roman Catholics and Independents. In this the Pope would take no direct action, but he had connived at the negotiations carried on with the Spanish ambassadors in London and Rome.[2]

October All this was far from encouraging to Meynell; yet, thanks to the good offices of Cardinal Capponi, he was granted an audience of the Pope, Innocent X., in less than three weeks after his arrival. He opened the interview by boldly reproaching the Pontiff with Rinnucini's conduct in Ireland, and then proceeded to lay Charles's desires before him. The Pope listened to all 'with paternal kindness,' praised Meynell's Italian, promised the absolution of the Confederates, and undertook to 'consider' the other matters. Meynell suggested that, while he considered, Cromwell would conquer Ireland.

'Well!' said his Holiness, 'I'll do my endeavour to prevent that.'

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 504-7. *Clarendon, History*, xii. pp. 81-114; xiii. pp. 10-20, 24-31.

[2] Carte's *Ormonde*, iii. p. 420.

1650 January-July

But nothing more could be done until Rinnucini returned to answer for himself. Meynell protested against the delay in vain, and Capponi assured him that though Rinnucini had displeased the Pope, and his advice would certainly not be followed, yet he must be heard to save appearances.

It was, therefore, not till January 1650 that a congregation of Cardinals was called to consider Charles's affairs. There seemed good hope that the Nuncio at Madrid would be empowered to treat with Hyde and Cottington, but the business dragged, and Hyde wrote to remonstrate on the slowness of the negotiation. It would be 'a very gracious and decent action,' he urged, 'if the Pope would give the King a present for his private support.' But the Pope required definite concessions before he parted with money, and Charles required money before he made concessions, so that the affair was at a deadlock. Gladly would Meynell have hastened its progress, for his own supplies were failing him. 'If a quick expense of my life would notably advantage my King's affairs, I could be at the charge with ease,' he wrote; 'but to die living and lingering will be insupportable.' The fact was that Charles's negotiations with the Scots were rapidly cooling any affection felt for him at Rome. In vain Meynell urged that the King would gladly have embraced the Papal alliance, and that only 'sheer necessity' had driven him to his present course. On the conclusion of the Treaty of Breda the Pope 'made a stand,' and gave Meynell 'a flat answer,' to the effect that he would not meddle with the affairs of a King who had put himself into the hands of the Scottish Presbyterians.

The whole transaction had brought Charles nothing but harm,[1] and at the end of July, Meynell, weary, disappointed, and impoverished, begged leave to depart from a place in which his presence was absolutely useless.

'Though it hath been the greatest misery that ever

[1] See page 173.

1649 November-December

befell me not to have been able to effect any notable thing for my Master's service,' he wrote, 'yet I shall ever comfort myself with the sincerity of my utmost endeavours, performed merely in duty, and in obedience to his commands.'[1]

Ireland was, by that time, beyond such help as the Pope could give her. Ormonde's melancholy report of November 1649 had not exaggerated her condition, and the state of the hapless kingdom grew daily more desperate. The alliance of English and Scottish Protestants with the Irish Catholics, produced by the King's death, had been of but brief duration. Sir George Monroe admitted a Parliamentary garrison to Enniskillen. Lord Inchiquin's men deserted to Cromwell, and Inchiquin, unjustly suspected by the Confederates, was deprived of his merely nominal command. Galway, the only district on which Ormonde could rely, was devastated by the plague, and the only Royalist force in the field—if Royalist it can be called—was the Ulster army of 6000 men. The death of Owen O'Neil had left this force without a leader, and for several months it lay inactive, wholly occupied with disputes concerning the command. At last, in February 1650, Emer Macmahon, Bishop of Clogher, was elected General. The Bishop was a good friend to Ormonde, and proved a better soldier than might have been expected. He maintained his army for about four months, and gained some successes in Antrim, but was finally defeated by Coote at Scarriffhollis, on June 21st, 1650. The overthrow was complete; the army was cut to pieces; and its leaders, the Bishop and Henry O'Neil, were taken and hanged, together with many of their officers.

November 6th

1650 February

June 21st

March 28th

Cromwell, in the meantime, had continued his victorious career in the south, taking fortress after fortress, and slaughtering without mercy. On the 28th of March Kilkenny, the headquarters of the Irish Confederates,

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xl. fol. 122. *Clarendon State Papers*, ii. pp. 493-7, 510, 531-4.

fell into his hands, and in April he granted permission to the English and Scottish Protestants to leave the country. At the same time he sent a pass to Ormonde, couched in flattering terms, and accompanied by a promise that Lady Ormonde should be left in possession of her estates, if her husband departed at once. The courtesy of the action—if so it was meant—was marred by the meanness that prompted Cromwell to send a copy of the pass to Preston at Waterford, in the hope of making the garrison believe that the Lord-Lieutenant was about to desert them. Preston, however, sent the paper on to Ormonde, who returned it contemptuously to the English General. 1650 April

'I have, by this trumpeter, returned you your paper,' he wrote. 'And, for your unsought courtesy, I do assure you that when you shall desire a pass from me, and I think fit to grant it, I shall not make use of it to corrupt any that commands under you.'

There was small probability that Cromwell would be reduced to seek that favour of his opponent; but already his presence was urgently needed elsewhere, and the capture of Clonmel, on the 10th of May, completed the number of his Irish successes. On the 26th of the same month he sailed for England, leaving behind him a memory accursed, and a bitter racial hatred that centuries have not availed to heal. May

The completion of the conquest was now a mere matter of time; but Ireton, whom Cromwell had appointed his deputy, was not equal to dealing with the situation, and the Irish were still able to carry on a guerilla warfare. May-July

The position of the Lord-Lieutenant had, however, become untenable. He had no longer an army in the field, nor could he exact obedience from any of the forces that remained in arms. Moreover, Limerick and Galway, which, with Athlone, were the only fortified towns remaining to the Royalists, refused to receive garrisons at his bidding. Vainly had he laboured,

1650 suffered, and endured. Vain had been his patience, forbearance, and unselfish devotion. The Treaty of Breda had ruined him as it had ruined Montrose. He stood, distrusted and discredited, alone! Yet it was not strange that the Catholic Confederates should reject the faithful servant of a King who had sworn to break the treaty that he had made with them. Nor could Charles's careful explanations that the concession had been wrung from him, and that he had not the least intention of keeping his oath, suffice to restore their confidence in him. Ormonde was the Lieutenant of a sovereign who had betrayed his subjects, and it did not need the machinations of his private enemies to inflame their Celtic minds against him. A few of his personal friends, such as Clanricarde, Muskerry, and Castlehaven, to whom the real nobility of his character was known, entreated him to remain amongst them; but the clergy were the only organising force left in the country, and they would have none of him. On August 12th, 1650, an assembly of prelates declared the Lord-Lieutenant deposed from office, and excommunicated all who should adhere to him.

August-September

Ormonde could not, of course, accept his dismissal from that self-constituted authority, but he realised that the best thing he could do for Ireland was to leave her. His presence could no longer serve her, but his absence would make way for a new Lieutenant, who, being of their own faith, might win the confidence of the Roman Catholic prelates, reunite the Confederates, and recover the authority lost by his predecessor.[1] Accordingly, Ormonde announced that he only awaited the King's permission to quit his post, and, on the 13th of October, that permission was brought to him by the Dean of Tuam.

October

'I have received your letter by Daniel O'Neil,' wrote Charles, 'and he has given me a full account of that

[1] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 102. Ormonde's Reasons for Departure, December 1650.

Kingdom (Ireland) and of your condition there, which I find to be so ill that I give you free leave to come from thence, when you shall think fit. For the way of it I desire you to use the safest. I believe this bearer will tell you that this country (Scotland) will not bid you welcome, for indeed they are not so kind to you as I could wish. Therefore I think France or Holland will be the fittest place for the present, but I shall leave that to your choice. I will only add this, that you have a care of yourself, which will be the greatest service you can do your most affect. friend, CHARLES R.'[1] 1650

Thus relieved of his responsibilities, Ormonde informed the prelates of his resolution to depart, appointed Ulick de Burgh, Marquis of Clanricarde, his deputy, and sailed for France on December 11th, 1650. The Dean of Tuam returned to Scotland, to give Charles an account of his Lieutenant's action, and the reasons that had prompted it. December

Clanricarde, himself one of the Confederate Catholics, had accepted the charge laid upon him with reluctance. He knew, only too well, the difficulties in his path—difficulties which were enhanced by his own failing health; and nothing but a stern sense of duty could have induced him to take up the burden. His first act was to demand a formal recognition of his authority, as the King's Lieutenant, from the clergy of his Church, and this was accorded him. On December 23rd the Clerical Assembly passed a vote of confidence in him, and excommunicated all who should attempt to treat without his sanction. But, even so fortified, his task was a hopeless one. Thirty thousand Irishmen still remained in arms, and a few strongholds were recovered from the enemy, but plague and famine raged through the land, and all the while the English conquest went steadily on.

Ireton was joined in January 1651 by four Commissioners from the English Parliament, of whom Ludlow was the chief. In June he forced the passage of the Shannon and laid siege to Limerick. The city held 1651 January-June

[1] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 645. King to Ormonde, 19th August 1650.

1651 October 27th

out for nearly five months, and, after enduring terrible sufferings, capitulated on October 27th, against the will of its governor, the valiant Hugh O'Neil.

November 26th

The approach of winter, and the death of Ireton, saved Galway from a like fate; but the respite was merely temporary, and Ireton was succeeded by Ludlow, who carried on his work.[1]

There could be no salvation for Ireland unless some foreign potentate interfered powerfully in her behalf, and the Confederates had long sought aid from various princes. The Pope, Philip of Spain, and the Archduke Leopold had all been solicited in vain, but the person to whom the Irish looked most hopefully was the Duke Charles of Lorraine.

Charles IV. of Lorraine was a singular personage, gifted with 'great wit and presentness of mind,' but chiefly notorious for his bad faith. James of York described him as 'a prince not much accustomed to keep his word.' Mazarin asserted: 'On ne peut nullement compter sur un homme aussi léger'; and his habitual falsehood was thus celebrated by the poet Pavillon in an epitaph composed after the Duke's death:

> 'Ci-gît un pauvre duc sans terre
> Qui fut jusqu'à ses derniers jours
> Peu fidèle dans ses amours
> Et moins fidèle dans ses guerres.'

A French gentleman, who knew him well, observed that he had 'the eyes of a cat,' and suspected his brain to be somewhat deranged; but, be that as it may, neither his evil reputation nor the loss of his duchy appeared to cause him much trouble of mind. He had been driven out of Lorraine by France in 1634, and had lived ever since as a mere captain of mercenaries. Retreating to Brussels, he had taken service with Spain on a kind of yearly lease, always retaining the independent command

[1] Carte's *Ormonde*, iii. pp. 500-618. Gardiner's *Commonwealth*, II. ix.

CHARLES IV, DUKE OF LORRAINE.

From the engraving by Moncornet in the British Museum.

of his own troops and a voice in the council of war. His men lived chiefly by pillage, and were suffered to commit all atrocities with impunity, but they formed the most effective part of the Spanish forces, and their leader received large sums of money in return for their services. He might, had he so chosen, have maintained some state and magnificence, and, in point of fact, 'no man knew better how to act the prince,' but he greatly preferred his ease and comfort, and had thrown aside all restraints of rank in his private life. He kept neither court nor coach nor retinue, and lived in an ordinary, poorly furnished house. 'Nor was he often there,' says Hyde, 'nor easy to be found.' A single valet supplied all the attendance he needed. He drove, when he had occasion to drive, in a carriage hired at five sous, and he did not disdain to bargain in person with the cobblers who supplied second-hand boots to his army. His leisure hours were passed among the Flemish burghers, whose company he greatly affected, and with whom he lived 'in a jolly familiarity.'[1]

One grief only weighed on his spirits and marred the easy carelessness of his life: this was the illegitimacy of his children. He had married early his cousin Nicole, daughter of his uncle, Henri of Lorraine and Bar, from whom he had inherited the duchy. But this marriage was merely a marriage of policy, and, a few years later, the Duke fell violently in love with Beatrix de Cusance, widow of Eugène, Count de Cantecroix. Failing to get a divorce from Nicole, he nevertheless went through the form of marriage with Beatrix, in defiance of the Pope and the Church. Thenceforth the Countess rode always by his side, and accompanied him upon all his campaigns, thus earning for herself the title of his 'femme de compagne.'

By her he had two children, a son and a daughter, and

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xii. p. 50. *Memoirs of James II.*, i. p. 84. Chéruel, *Minorité de Louis XIV.*, ii. p. 294. Renée, *Nièces de Mazarin*, pp. 274-5. *Mémoires de Ségrais*, p. 120.

1650 it was his most passionate desire to get his second marriage sanctioned and his children legitimated by the Pope.

It was this desire that first turned his thoughts towards Ireland. If he earned the Papal gratitude by succouring the distressed Catholics, he hoped to be rewarded by the concession of that for which he had so long petitioned in vain. But, failing this, he might at least obtain possession of a kingdom which, being won by right of conquest, could be bequeathed to the son whom the bar sinister shut out from hereditary lands and titles.

April Charles had himself opened the way for this enterprise in April 1650, when, at the instigation of Hugh Rochefort, Recorder of Wexford, he proposed to mortgage the fort of Duncannon for £24,000. The Duke of Lorraine accepted the offer, and sent over two agents, Rochefort and a certain Colonel Synott, to arrange the affair with the Lord-Lieutenant.

June These agents reached Ireland early in June, but, as they carried no credentials, Ormonde very naturally declined to put any stronghold into their hands. They, for their part, maintained that they had been intrusted with letters from both the King and the Duke, but had been obliged to throw them overboard when chased by a Parliamentary frigate. Ormonde, though more than doubtful of their story, attempted to treat with them, but their conduct only increased his distrust, and he had no alternative but to send to the King for instructions.

July-October Theobald, Lord Taafe, was accordingly sent to Breda, but found, on his arrival there, that the King had already gone to Scotland. Taafe was thus thrown on his own resources, but he was unwilling to abandon the hope of aid, and, being of a bold and enterprising spirit, he resolved to take up the negotiation himself. To facilitate this he visited James of York, in Jersey, and obtained from him a letter of credence to the Duke of Lorraine. Next he sought the Queen in Paris, and, at her bidding, sent Ormonde's letters to Charles in Scotland. But

Charles's reply was long delayed; and, in November, Taafe, finding funds and patience fail him, set out for Brussels. 1650 November

There he found his uncle, Father George Dillon, high in Lorraine's favour, and his own reception was proportionately cordial. The Duke listened sympathetically to the story of Ireland's sufferings, and professed himself eager to go personally to her defence. The hot-blooded Irishman was no match for the wily Lorrainer, and Taafe, deceived by the Duke's genial sympathy, entirely lost his head. The Queen had authorised him to raise a loan on the security of certain forts in Ireland, but now he rashly promised the surrender of any places that Lorraine might choose; proposed, on his own responsibility, a match between James of York and the Duke's little daughter Anne; and undertook that the King would confirm any treaty concluded by himself.

Lorraine listened with delight, and promised that, in the event of the marriage, he would furnish James with the fleet, money, and arms necessary for the reconquest of Ireland. As an earnest of his good intentions, he pressed upon Taafe a loan of £5000, for which he refused to take any bond, and he protested that, if he came to Ireland, he would seek no title other than his own. At the end of all this, he 'confounded' Taafe by adding suddenly that he should expect entire obedience from all persons in Ireland.

This unexpected climax rather dashed Taafe's spirits; but, believing that Lorraine alone could save his 'gasping country,' he proposed that an agent should be sent to treat directly with the authorities in Ireland. To this the Duke agreed, and in January 1651 he despatched thither Stephen de Henin, Abbot of St. Catharine's, who sailed in the company of Father Dillon. 1651 January

James of York, who was then at Brussels, was informed by Lord Inchiquin of the marriage project, and, in his craving to be important, he received the overture gladly. He answered, says Inchiquin, 'that he had a great March

1651 March esteeme of the lady, and of her father, whose allyance he does not less value.'[1]

James could not well contract a marriage without his brother's consent, but Lorraine appeared to assume that all was concluded. He demanded that his daughter's jointure should be secured in Ireland, that his son-in-law elect should be sent thither with Ormonde, and that he should be at once provided with 'a more honourable state and following.' He also talked 'largely' of the succours that he was about to send to the Irish, asked for Rupert's help in the transportation of his army, and wrote to Ormonde requesting him to obtain, through the English Queen, the free use of the French ports.[2] At the same time he opened a new and secret treaty with the disaffected clergy of Ireland.

Taafe, though ignorant of this, had become imbued with doubts of the Duke's sincerity, and he qualified his assurance to Inchiquin that all was now settled with the phrase: 'If credit may be given to what the Duke of Lorraine assures me every day, which, by what others say, is a doubt to be made.'[3]

Inchiquin was even more sceptical:—

'I entend to advertise the Duke of York of what Lord Taafe has spoken to me,' he wrote to Ormonde; 'but I shall not advise him to believe all that the Duke of Lorraine says, nor to meddle with the business without good assurance, in writinge, of the Duke's promises, and of the King's approbation. For I doe not like the manner of the propositions, which, I feare, are not with cleare intentions to the King's service.'

And three weeks later he wrote more plainly:—

'I find that the Duke of Lorraine speaks to some of his friends that he is confident his agent has agreed with the Irish, to whom, it is said, he intends to send considerable supplies. And, if he sends anything more than

[1] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 283.
[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 243-6.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 243.

what is already gone, you may be confident that he intends to make himself king.'[1] 1651 February

Such was in truth the intention of Lorraine. His emissary had reached Ireland in February 1651, bearing letters addressed—not to Ormonde's deputy—but to 'the Lords administrating the Government of Ireland.' Clanricarde, justly offended by this slight, refused to receive him; nor could the Abbot's apology and assurances that he had been unaware that a Deputy-Lieutenant still remained in Ireland, avail to shake his resolution. De Henin was therefore obliged to send Father Dillon to acquaint Clanricarde with Lorraine's demands. These were in accordance with the superscription of the letter, and amounted to a proposal for the transference of the sovereignty of Ireland to the House of Lorraine. The Duke and his heirs were to be named Protectors-Royal of the kingdom, wielding an authority second to none, and Galway and Limerick were to be at once ceded to Lorraine as security for the fulfilment of his conditions. Clanricarde merely expressed his amazement that any one should have ventured to suggest such terms; but the majority of his countrymen saw them in another light. The loyalty of the Confederates, never strong, had waned considerably since Charles had gone to the Scots; and now a representative body, the Committee of Trust, and a council of nobles and prelates, entered into negotiation with De Henin, and voted the acceptance of his terms, 'saving his Majesty's just rights, and the property of his subjects.' Their action was speedily quashed by Clanricarde, who reproached them with entertaining 'treasonable' projects, and sternly forbade them to attempt anything more than the raising of a loan. Finally, the Abbot offered to lend £20,000 on the security of the few towns remaining to the Irish, but referred all other particulars to a treaty to be made at Brussels, whither Clanricarde consented to send representatives.[2]

[1] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fols. 267, 334.

[2] Clanricarde's *Memoirs*, App. vi.-xxvi. *Dom. State Papers*, Inter., xv. p. 94.

1651 The persons selected for this mission were Sir Nicholas Plunckett, Geoffrey Brown, and Lord Taafe himself. Their instructions were to negotiate a loan after the method already indicated, but to do no more without the express orders of the Queen and the Duke of York, and to sign no treaty unapproved by them.

April Brown and Plunckett left Ireland on April 23rd, but they did not reach Brussels until June 12th. Taafe had by that time received a letter from the King, bidding him follow the Queen's advice in all matters relating to Ireland, and it was agreed that he should go at once to Paris with Clanricarde's letter to the Queen and a copy of the commissioners' instructions. Henrietta was in no mood to receive him graciously. She had at last been made aware of the treaty with Lorraine, and was very angry with both Taafe and Inchiquin, who had, she considered, presumed very greatly, especially as regarded James's proposed marriage. Ormonde, himself pledged to secrecy by Taafe, had, several months previously, warned his friend of the probable consequences of his conduct. 'Out of the friendship you justly presume from me,' he wrote, 'I advise that, if anything be done in it, you lose no further time in acquainting the Queen with the part you have had in it, and the motives inducing you to it, which will come better from yourself than from any other that may inform her of it.'[1]

June But Taafe had not accepted the advice, and thus it was not until June that a request, sent by Ormonde, for permission for Lorraine's troops to march through France, brought the progress of the affair to the Queen's notice. She soon forgave Ormonde his offence of having kept his friends' secret, but against those friends she maintained resentment longer. They were evidently, she said, 'peu accoutumés à vivre avec les rois,'[2] and it was not until after Taafe's arrival in Paris that Ormonde succeeded in obtaining her pardon for him and Inchiquin.

[1] *Clanricarde*, App. p. 33. [2] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 514.

When he was at last admitted to an audience, Taafe learnt that both the Queen and Ormonde had the poorest possible opinion of his treaty. Lorraine, they told him, was 'an artful, designing man, covetous, rapacious, and saving of his money,' whom they suspected of secret intrigues with Spain. Moreover, France had already declined to let him pass through her territory, even with unarmed troops, and neither Flanders nor Holland would permit him to make use of their ports. At the best, it was absurd to send an army to a country which lacked, not men, but the means to support them. 1651

Taafe was therefore bidden to return to Brussels and treat for money, as Clanricarde had directed; but it was too late.

Plunckett and Brown had found Lorraine already in treaty with the Bishop of Ferns, Rochefort, and other of the disaffected Irish, and had been induced to exceed their instructions by the persuasions of their countrymen, and their own eagerness to obtain supplies. On July 22nd, acting not in the name of the Lord Deputy who had sent them, but in the name of 'the kingdom and people of Ireland,' from whom they held no powers, they signed a treaty with Lorraine, which was, in effect, the same as that previously rejected by Clanricarde. In it the Duke stipulated that his efforts for the defence of religion should be duly represented to the Pope, and he engaged to resign his newly acquired powers to the King whenever his expenses should have been fully repaid. In addition to this the Bishop of Ferns drew up a petition, submitting to the Pope in the name of the nation, which Plunckett signed, and to which Taafe's name was appended in his absence. July

The new treaty, signed by Lorraine and the commissioners, was brought to Ireland by Colonel Synott in October, and, as might have been anticipated, Clanricarde lost no time in repudiating it. In a letter, dated October 20th, 1651, he informed Lorraine that the treaty was null and void, since the commissioners had never been October

1651 October-November

empowered to conclude it. And, on the same day, he wrote to Brown and Plunckett, 'You have, in a high measure, violated the trust I reposed in you on his Majesty's behalf.' They subsequently excused their conduct, and were pardoned by the King, on the grounds of their zeal for the public welfare and their alleged belief that the Queen approved their treaty, but did not wish to appear in it while her son was with the Scots.

The citizens of Galway would have accepted the treaty in spite of Clanricarde, but Lorraine judged their overtures to be no good basis to work on. Moreover, the King's return to France, and a letter received from him in November, left the Duke no excuse for dealing with unauthorised persons. He dropped the whole affair the more readily because he found that his proceedings had excited no interest at Rome.[1]

Ireland, thus left to her own resources, could no longer hope to resist the English conquest. In October 1651 Ormonde wrote to his brother-in-law, Lord Muskerry: 'As the case now stands, I conceive all men are at liberty to make the best shift they can for the support of themselves and theirs.' And he accordingly proposed that the Irish soldiers should now take service in France. Mazarin welcomed them gladly, and many took advantage of his offers, but the majority preferred to serve in Spain, where Daniel O'Neil had been promised the command of all the Irish forces. Great numbers of soldiers were, however, transported to both countries by private arrangements made by their officers with the French and Spanish ministers.

1652 February-May

In February 1652 Clanricarde offered to treat with England, but Ludlow rejected the overture and continued his work of destruction until May, when Galway fell, and all resistance was finally broken down. Clanricarde retired to England, where he died, and his hapless country

[1] Clanricarde's *Memoirs*, App. pp. 4-57. Ormonde Papers, *Historical MSS.*, Report 14, App. vii. p. 9. Carte's *Ormonde*, iii. pp. 596-613.

was left to the mercy of the English foe. That mercy was small; and religious persecution, tyranny, and oppressive legislation welded the Irish tribes and the English of the Pale into one wronged and resentful nation, thenceforth irreconcilable to its conqueror.

CHAPTER XIII

The Quarrel of the Queen with James of York—James's flight to Brussels—Death of the Prince of Orange—English Envoys at the Hague—Religious Dissensions at the English Court in Paris—The Return of James to Paris—The general Distrust of the Queen—Anxiety for the King—The State of France.

1650 June-September

WHILE the treaty with Lorraine had not availed to save Ireland, it had excited the Queen's displeasure against all concerned in it, and had considerably aggravated the differences, already risen, between herself and her second son.

When Charles sailed for Scotland he had bidden James join his mother in Paris, because he deemed France a safer refuge for his heir than Jersey. James had obeyed. To Charles's added injunction that he should 'conform himself entirely to the will and pleasure of the Queen,' he paid less attention.

The young Duke was, at that time, nearly seventeen, 'full of spirit and courage,' and by no means easy to control. In early childhood he had known excitement and adventure as the companion of his father during the Civil War. Later he had been a political prisoner, an object of interest and intrigue; and, since his escape from captivity, he had doubtless felt himself something of a hero. He longed passionately to take part in some attempt to restore the fallen fortunes of his house, yet now he saw himself doomed, for the second time, to a rôle of inaction, while his brother went forth to fight for Crown and Kingdom.

The Queen did nothing to soothe the boy's chafing spirit. Her own poverty made her unable to alleviate

the situation by providing him with interests or amusements of any kind, and her manner towards him, always arbitrary and repressive, fretted him extremely. Worse still, he hated Lord Jermyn, as Charles did, and had not, like Charles, the art of concealing his dislikes. In the circumstances friction was inevitable, and it increased daily. A speech of James, to the effect that the Queen 'loved and valued Lord Jermyn more than all her children,' was repeated to Henrietta. She retorted that Charles was 'of a better nature than James,' and added 'much more of great bitterness,' which was duly reported again to her son.

'I leave you to consider what impressions these things may (make) in each of them!' wrote Hatton to Nicholas.[1]

The impressions were, as suggested, the reverse of pleasing, and James's resentment was carefully fostered by his attendants. On his first arrival in Holland the Queen had, hastily and thoughtlessly, appointed him such a suite as was usually placed about an English prince. There was, of course, no money to support it, and she now 'paid the penalty in the peace and quiet of her mind.' For the members of the suite, idle, poor, and at variance one with another, were as discontented as was their young master. They discoursed to him ceaselessly of the systematic neglect with which the French Court treated him, of the unkindness shown to him by his own mother, and of the affluence — not to say splendour — enjoyed by Lord Jermyn, which they contrasted sharply with their own necessitous condition.

Other Royalists who feared the Queen's policy, and were anxious to remove her son from her control, added their voices to those of the boy's personal followers. Among these were Dr. Stewart, Sir George Radcliffe, and Rupert's friends — Lord Gerard, Sir Edward Herbert, and Thomas Elliot. James, always easily influenced by his brilliant cousin, lent a ready ear to the counsels of his friends, and was persuaded that he ought to leave

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 195.

1650 October

Paris as speedily as possible. A report of the King's death roused the plotters to action. Believing James to be now their Sovereign, they were more than ever anxious to remove him from his mother, and, in a council held by Dr. Stewart, Dr. Killigrew, James's chaplain, Gerard, and Elliot, it was decided to take him to Brussels.

James, who had been fired with a desire to imitate Charles of Lorraine, acquiesced willingly, and abruptly informed his mother of his intention to depart on the following day. Henrietta was greatly surprised, and demanded the reason of this sudden resolution. The boy replied that he was unable to reveal his schemes to her, but that he was about to visit the Duke of Lorraine, whom he believed he could persuade to help his brother. Henrietta, though vexed and offended, was satisfied that want of money would frustrate the intended journey, and took no more notice of the matter. But Radcliffe and Herbert, foreseeing this difficulty, had contrived to procure a sum sufficient to defray the expenses of the journey, and James was thus enabled to set out with them and Dr. Stewart, leaving his suite to follow or not as they chose.

Henrietta's first care, on learning this, was to order Lord Byron and the secretary, Henry Bennett, to follow her son ; her next was to write to Mazarin, disclaiming all responsibility for his flight.

'Il faut confesser mon peu de pouvoir avec lui,' she lamented. 'Il a voulu aller en Flandre, et sans vouloir me dire son dessein. . . . Je devrai être honteuse d'avouer cette affaire entre le duc d'Yorck et moi, mais avec vous je veux user de la franchise dans toutes mes affaires propres . . . et je vous proteste que c'est fort contre mon gré qu'il est allé en Flandre.'[1]

James reached Brussels on October 13th, and was received into the house of the English Resident, Sir Henry de Vic. There disappointment awaited him in the news that Lord Hopton and Sir Edward Nicholas

[1] De Baillon, *Henriette Marie de France*, p. 559, 8th October 1650.

had not seen fit to obey his summons thither. The 1650
advice and countenance of these two were earnestly desired by both James and his self-constituted counsellors, and Dr. Stewart had written, on October 1st, urging them to hasten to the Duke at Brussels. 'I find he intends to depend much on your counsel, and therefore entreat you not to fail him,' he concluded.

A few days after his arrival in Brussels he wrote to renew his entreaties, and added: 'The Duke's principles, both in religion and in point of duty and service to the King, are so very commendable that I doubt not that you would have been glad to be an ear-witness of them both. Public business he intends not to meddle with, without express direction and command from his Majesty, and to that end he is now sending into Scotland.'

Radcliffe joined his persuasions to the Dean's, alleging that there was much to say that could not be safely written; but all to no purpose. Both Hopton and Nicholas, albeit no favourites of the Queen, were very doubtful of the wisdom of James's conduct, and they declined to take any responsibility in the matter without direct orders from the King.[1]

Sir George Radcliffe therefore undertook the control of the household, Sir Edward Herbert assumed direction of the counsels, and the two, between them, appointed a new suite for the young Duke. Byron and Bennett naturally resented this officious conduct, and complained of the proceedings with much indignation. The others retorted that James, being now of an age to act for himself, had outgrown Byron's rule as governor, and had a right to choose his own attendants. Dr. Stewart added that 'the fifth commandment does not make a Queen-Mother a Queen-Regent.' And dissension raged in the household.[2]

The success of Radcliffe and Herbert was of the

[1] *Dom. State Papers*, Record Office, Interreg., xi. fols. 24, 41, 53.
[2] *Ibid.* xi. fols. 53, 74.

1650 briefest. The Duke of Lorraine visited James at once, generously presented him with the sum of 1000 pistoles, and, as has been seen, lent a ready ear to his proposal for the hand of his infant daughter. But the news that Charles was, after all, alive and well dealt a severe blow to the scheme. The cautious Lorraine required better security for the fulfilment of his conditions than James could give, and he did not care to talk in Latin, which was the only language that he had in common with Radcliffe. Moreover, he observed that Byron and Bennett, who were well able to converse with him, and whose offices entitled them to conduct the negotiation, took no part in it. He therefore declined to proceed further until assured of the King's consent, and thenceforth took very little notice of his would-be son-in-law.[1]

November The Queen believed that sheer necessity would now drive James back to France; but, though he was 'in all extremities of want,' his advisers would sooner have taken him 'into Germany, or indeed Japan, or the West Indies,' than back to his mother.[2] For nearly two months he remained in Brussels, deriving a scanty support from his share of the prizes taken by Royalist vessels, and with no better amusement than attending 'a Popish service.' This imprudent proceeding was justified to Nicholas by Dr. Stewart, on the grounds that James always went *incognito*, and 'sent to bespeak him a private place, where he might neither give nor receive offence.' 'One of those times he went to see three Knights of the Golden Fleece elected by the King of Spain's letters patent, which was done in Mass-time,' explained the Dean. 'Other time he went to hear the music, which oft-times was very good, and so was a kind of entertainment to him, having so little else in this place.'[3]

James had himself written to renew his solicitations

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 42.
[2] *Miscellanea Aulica*, p. 154. Cowley to Bennett, 18th November 1650.
[3] Cary's *Memorials*, ii. p. 230.

for Nicholas's presence, and to ask whether money could be obtained from Culpepper, if not for himself, at least to prevent the sale of the King's horses. Some of these were, he said, 'much prized' by Charles, and, failing an immediate supply of money, they would be sold, below their value, 'to pay for their meat.'[1] 1650

But the sum obtained by Culpepper in Moscow had been destined to other uses, and, in December, James was at the end of his resources. He saw no way but to throw himself upon the hospitality of his sister, the Princess of Orange, and he accordingly set out for the Hague, attended by four servants only. The Princess had, however, been forbidden by the Queen to receive her rebellious brother, and at Dort James was met by the Marquis de Vieuville, who begged him, in his sister's name, to proceed no farther. The young Duke, dismayed by this unexpected rebuff, was glad to accept the loan of the Queen of Bohemia's house at Rhenen, and thither he retired to spend a sad and solitary Christmas.[2] December

He had much reason for sadness, apart from his own private misfortunes; for his sister was now a widow, and the loss of the brother-in-law, who had been so faithful a friend to Charles and James, was a very serious blow to the Stuart cause. Though the Dutch were, for commercial reasons, very unwilling to provoke England, the young Stadtholder had stood firmly by his wife's family, and it was to the influence of the Orange party that the Royalists owed all the protection and countenance that they had enjoyed from the States. Nor was this all. William II.'s statesmanship and military talents had made him a power in Europe; he was able to influence both France and Spain, and he had cherished a hope of renewing the war with Spain, and engaging France, as the price of his alliance, to assist in the restoration of Charles to England. But the premature death of the Prince, which occurred on November 6th, 1650, had changed all this. The last few months of his life had

[1] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 203.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 208.

been embittered by a fierce struggle with the Republican party in Holland, and this party now gained the upper hand. The States of Holland, jealous of the growing power of the House of Orange, and deeply distrustful of the Stuart Princess, who was William's widow, refused to elect her infant son—born ten days after the Prince's death—to be Stadtholder in his father's stead. The power of the House of Orange fell into abeyance, the army was left without a commander-in-chief, and each State administered its own affairs as pleased it best. Friesland and Groningen chose, for their Stadtholder, Count William Frederick of Nassau, the friend and counsellor of William II., but the States of Holland took to themselves all the powers hitherto vested in the Stadtholder, and turned resolutely towards the English Commonwealth.

The Royalists were not slow to realise their misfortune, and the poet Cowley did but voice the general opinion when he declared the dead Prince to have been 'the most considerable man, not only to us, but to all this part of the world, that could have been taken out of it.'[1] To Hyde the loss appeared as a direct judgment of Heaven, consequent on the King's desertion of the English Church,[2] and Charles himself was keenly sensible of all that it involved. The news did not reach him until January 1651, and, immediately on hearing it, he wrote to the Baron van Heenvliet, superintendent of his sister's household: 'Because it is impossible for me to tell you in a letter the great affliction and sorrow I have for the loss of my dear brother, the Prince of Orange, I shall leave you to imagine it, by the reasons I have for it, and the interest you know I have in it; though my affection and friendship to his person are of farre greater concernment to me than any other consideration whatsoever.'[3]

This letter was accompanied by another to Heenvliet's

[1] *Miscellanea Aulica*, p. 154, 18th November 1650. Cowley to Bennett.
[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, 5th December 1650. Hyde to Nicholas.
[3] *Rawlinson MSS.*, cxv. fol. 105, Bodl. Library, 21st-31st January 1651.

English wife, Lady Stanhope,[1] in which Charles poured out all his affectionate solicitude for his young sister :—

'I cannot chuse but tell you I shall put the services you doe her upon my account. . . . How my sister does for her health, and with what discretion she bears her misfortune; whether my nephew be lusty and strong, whom he is like, and a hundred such questions, I desire the answer of under your hand, because a lesse evidence will not satisfy the curiosity I have for those I am so much concerned in. What care the States take for the young General, and how kind and careful the (Dowager) Princess of Orange is of him, and what provision is made for my sister's present support I hope I shall hear from your husband.'[2]

James also hastened to express his sorrow for 'this great losse that is happened to us all,'[3] but, excepting perhaps the widow herself, no one felt it more deeply than did Queen Henrietta. She had depended much upon her son-in-law, who greatly admired her, and the violence of her grief for him surprised and shocked some of the Court. They observed, censoriously, that she had received the news of the Princess Elizabeth's death with less emotion,[4] yet it was, indeed, natural enough. Death had brought to the poor little girl a welcome release from a sorrowful captivity, while the loss of the young man, suddenly cut off ere his prime, involved far-reaching issues. To the Queen, worn and weary with suffering, long anxiety, and frequent disappointment, it was, as she herself said, 'the last blow,' and, in an access of despair, she wrote to Heenvliet:

'Je suis si accablée de douleur de la perte que je viens de faire que je ne suis pas capable de rien dire de cet, mon dernier coup.'[5]

But, when the first shock was over, her thoughts turned tenderly to her widowed daughter, and she despatched

[1] Widow of Henry, Lord Stanhope, eldest son of Philip, Earl of Chesterfield.
[2] *Rawlinson MSS.*, cxv. fol. 99.
[3] *Ibid.* cxv. fol. 125.
[4] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 198, 200.
[5] *Rawlinson MSS.*, cxv. fol. 63.

1650 December — Jermyn to the Hague, charged with messages of comfort and counsel. Henry Seymour had, by that time, arrived from Scotland, bearing Charles's commands to James to return at once to Paris and conform to the wishes of his mother. It was therefore confidently expected that he would make the return journey with Jermyn, and bets on the subject were laid freely at the Louvre. But the unsettled state of France, which was again on the verge of civil war, made the Queen unwilling to insist on her son's immediate return thither. Moreover, Charles had added to his instructions an injunction that Ormonde, Nicholas, and Dr. Stewart should remain in constant attendance on his brother, and the presence of the two last was exceedingly distasteful to Henrietta.[1] Perhaps also she was willing that her daughter should have at least one member of her family near her in her sorrow, and, after a conference with Jermyn at Rhenen, James was permitted to go to the Hague.

1651 January — He arrived there on the 12th of January 1651, and was warmly welcomed by his sister Mary. Three days later her little son was christened, and the Princess Dowager of Orange expressed a desire that James should carry the child to church. Mary, however, objected strongly, fearing perhaps that her baby might not be safe in the arms of her young brother; and, in deference to her wishes, he declined the honour.

March — Some weeks later he acted as chief mourner at the state funeral of his brother-in-law, which took place at Delft on the 8th of March. This post, which he claimed as his sister's representative, was disputed with him by the Princes of Portugal, who were related to the House of Orange; and, so deep was their offence when the claim of James prevailed, that they turned back and refused to attend the funeral at all.[2]

Towards the end of the same month, the arrival of envoys

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. 209, 211. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., xi. fol. 118. *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 215.

[2] *Mercurius Politicus*, 16th-26th March 1651.

from the English Parliament seriously embarrassed James's position. These envoys, Oliver St. John and Walter Strickland, came to negotiate a close alliance between the English Commonwealth and the United Provinces, and it was impossible for James to be a witness of their reception by the States. Accordingly he retired to Breda, but returned, when the formal reception was over, with forty followers in his train, and thenceforth his presence proved a source of annoyance and even danger to the English envoys at the Hague. 1651

Though the rulers of the Dutch Republic earnestly desired a good understanding with England, the sympathies of the Dutch populace were heartily Orange and Royalist. The presence of a Stuart prince in its midst roused it to frenzy, and the numbers of the mob were swelled by English Cavaliers and members of the French Embassy. The Parliamentarians were daily exposed to insult and peril. The boys in the streets saluted them as 'regicides.' The household of the Queen of Bohemia insulted them with impunity; their servants were attacked if they ventured forth, and their house was continually surrounded by a dangerous rabble, which hurled stones and brickbats through the windows, and endeavoured to break down the gates. The States-General sent guards to disperse the mob, but it persistently returned with unabated zeal, and the unfortunate Englishmen lived in a state of siege. 'We dare hardly peep out of doors in an evening,' reported one of the suite.[1] April

In these circumstances, the States became as impatient of James's presence as they had formerly been of Charles's residence among them, and Mary dared not detain her brother against their wishes. Widowed and defenceless as she was, she depended almost wholly on the goodwill of the States, and her difficulties were enhanced by the enmity of her mother-in-law, who was resolved, wrote an angry Royalist, 'by suytes in law to add vexation and

[1] *Mercurius Politicus*, 8th, 11th, 27th April 1651. Cary's *Memorials*, ii. p. 259.

trouble to the many sad afflictions of the virtuous Princess Royal.'[1] Mary had been left by her husband sole guardian of their child, but the Princess Dowager disputed the will, and endeavoured to obtain control of the boy on the double plea that Mary was herself a minor and therefore legally incapable of acting as tutrix, and that her royal birth and natural affection for her brothers would lead her to endanger the interests of her son. The States alone could protect the young mother from this attack, and Mary, anxious to avoid all cause of offence, sent James to Breda, and wrote urgently to her mother, begging her to recall him before he should be formally requested to withdraw.

James professed himself 'most willing to comply in all things' with Charles's directions, if the Queen would supply the necessary funds for the journey, since he was himself absolutely penniless.[2] But he maintained his attitude of hostility to Jermyn, and offered neither apology nor submission to his mother. The breach remained therefore unhealed, and in April Sir Edward Nicholas wrote indignantly to Ormonde:

'Whatever the Duke does, that is not suitable to the Queen's mind, and to the little designs of those about her, is presently interpreted and reported to be a factious plot. . . . I cannot say that I believe he doth conceive that the Queen, or any about her esteems him, or hath much kindness for him. I do not discern any disposition or inclination in the Duke of York to do anything that may, in the least manner, distaste the King, but I very much apprehend that, if he shall find that his great desire to merit by his obedience shall be still misrepresented, and that his person, being now past a child, shall be by the Queen and her sycophants rendered contemptible in their table discourses, it may, I doubt, make him give an ear to counsels and persons that may put other things into his head than his natural good disposition inclines him to.'[3]

[1] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 197. [2] *Ibid.* xxix. fol. 293.
[3] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 404, 441.

The quarrel between mother and son was rapidly 1651
becoming a party question. Many royalists, distrusting the Louvre faction, sympathised with James, and it must be confessed that Henrietta's conduct at this juncture was not conciliatory. On the contrary, she chose to embitter the situation with religious controversy.

When she first came to France, in 1644, she had been accompanied by Dr. John Cosins, Dean of Peterborough, and later Bishop of Durham, whom the King had appointed chaplain to the Anglican members of her suite. Her passion for proselytising notwithstanding, she had respected the wishes of her husband and treated the Dean well, granting him a sum, from her own pension, sufficient for his support, and giving up, for use as an English chapel, a room in her own apartments. In that room her sons and the Anglicans of her household had daily attended matins and evensong throughout the week, and on Sundays the whole congregation adjourned to the house of Sir Richard Browne, the English resident in Paris, where there was a celebration of the Holy Communion and a sermon.

But when the second Charles had taken the covenant and gone to Scotland, the English Church fell into disrepute in Paris. It was believed that the King had finally abandoned the Church for which—even more than for himself—the best of his adherents had fought and suffered; hopes of her ultimate restoration were proportionately diminished, and the faith of many of her members waxed weak and faint. In these circumstances the Queen's ceaseless efforts to draw the Anglicans of her household within the fold of Rome met with a frequent and rapid success. And when the Queen-Regent of France entreated her sister-in-law to suppress the heretical worship, alleging that the troubles of the French Crown had been sent in punishment for its toleration within the palace walls, Henrietta readily assented, and calmly informed Dr. Cosins that she could no longer support him.

1651 May

'They are ashamed of the design of putting down the service, and have found a neater way of starving out the parson, and then they think the congregation will dissolve quietly,' declared Hatton.[1]

Worse was to follow. In May the clergy of France offered to raise a new pension for the English Queen, but intimated that they could not be expected to contribute to the support of Protestants; whereupon Henrietta was understood to promise that she would dismiss from her service, 'by degrees, and in convenient time,' all heretics who were not able to support themselves.[2]

Affairs were in this state when Hyde visited Paris on his return from Spain, and he was immediately assailed on all sides with complaints, accusations, and lamentations. On the one hand the injured Anglicans related, with deep resentment, the history of the persecution from which they suffered. On the other the Queen poured forth her own grievances, and adjured the Chancellor to seek out her erring son and induce his return to her roof and guidance. The discreet Hyde endeavoured to hold the balance between the contending factions, and while he readily promised to attempt the reclaiming of James, he ventured to point out to the Queen that her present course of conduct supplied her son with an excellent excuse for his flight, and could not fail to have a bad effect on the King's English adherents. Henrietta heard him with patience and admitted the reasonableness of his remarks, but protested her own inability to act otherwise. The Queen-Regent had, she said, constantly reproached her with want of zeal for her religion and carelessness of her children's salvation. Moreover her old director, Father Philips, 'a pious, prudent, quiet, and inoffensive man,' who had always counselled toleration and forbearance, had lately died, and his successor, Walter Montagu, a son of the Earl of Manchester, and a convert to the

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 159. *Miscellanea Anglica*, p. 142. *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 44.

[2] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 484. *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 449.

Roman Church, was as zealous for his new Church and as intolerant of the old one as converts are wont to be. Finally the Queen promised to pay something out of her poverty to Dr. Cosins, and to endeavour to arrange for an Anglican service in some person's private lodgings. For the rest, she referred Hyde to Montagu, who proved absolutely immovable, and merely observed, in reply to the Chancellor's remonstrances, that the King of France would never again suffer heretical worship within the palace, not even if Charles himself were to return thither.[1]

Finding that he could do no more good in Paris, Hyde resolved to visit his family at Antwerp, and set out on his journey, bearing with him the Queen's letter of recall to the Duke of York, and the verbal promise of a pension for him from the Crown of France. On the way he met with Henry Seymour, whom James had sent to prepare the Queen for his own return, and whose dismal account of the young Duke's condition caused the Chancellor to make all possible haste to Breda.[2]

There he found James's household 'in all the confusion imaginable, in present want of everything, and not knowing what was to be done next.' Though the members of the suite agreed in nothing else, all concurred in the condemnation of Sir Edward Herbert as a person 'of that intolerable pride, that it was not possible for any man to converse with him.' And he, on his part, made no secret of his supreme contempt of his colleagues.

Hyde perceived that the sooner he could remove the Duke from this environment the better it would be on all accounts, and more especially because the English envoys were daily pressing the States-General to banish him. Nor did James himself desire any further delay. He was still young enough to be more pleased with his adventures than regretful of his folly, and he was still determined not to own himself in the wrong, but he was, for all that, very

[1] Carte's *Ormonde*, iii. p. 635. *Clarendon, History*, xiii. pp. 44-5.
[2] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 522.

1651 glad to receive his mother's letter, and on the very next day he set out for France.[1]

He would fain have taken with him Nicholas and Inchiquin, but both preferred to remain in Holland, the former because he entertained a just apprehension of the Queen's displeasure, and the latter because he did not choose to be involved in a factious contest with the Louvre party.

June James himself had no reason to expect a very cordial reception from his mother, but Seymour had proved a good ambassador, and Henrietta welcomed her unrepentant prodigal with kindness. But though she forbore to reproach him with what was past, she maintained an air of implacable severity towards those whom she regarded as the instigators of his revolt, and, as the old causes of grievance remained, the reconciliation was not established on any firm basis.

The Queen was no richer than before, and though, for the first few weeks after his return, she suffered her son to dine at her table, she expected him to maintain both himself and his train on the yearly pension of 4000 pistoles, granted to him by the Crown of France. But the French treasury was empty, James's pension was charged on no particular fund, but depended on a private promise of the Queen-Regent, and its payment was 'dribbling and uncertain.' It was not long before the young Duke felt again the pinch of poverty, and want of money deprived him of such pleasures as might have fallen to his lot. The French Court was kind and friendly, but he was obliged to decline the invitations to share in its gaieties at Fontainebleau. More bitter still—he could not join the French army for want of the necessary outfit![2] These things were not the fault of the Queen; neither, perhaps, was the suppression of the Anglican chapel within the Louvre; but James, like

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 46.

[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 461; ii. p. 40. *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 484. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 274.

JAMES STUART, DUKE OF YORK.

From the engraving by Migé in the British Museum, after the portrait by Van Dyck.

other people, held her mainly responsible, and asserted his intention of demanding from the Regent 'a place for the exercise of his religion.'[1] 1651 July

Thus was the recent reconciliation imperilled, and on the 15th of July, within a month of James's return, Ormonde wrote to Hyde: 'There is not, in my observation, that confidence betwixt the Queen and his Royal Highness as were both necessary and comely.'[2]

Ormonde had come to Paris in compliance with the King's wishes and James's request, but sorely against his own will. His extreme poverty made that gay city 'no place of abiding' for him, and he did not feel well qualified for the work required of him by the Duke, namely 'the proportioning of his expenses to the quantity, and possible uncertainty, of his pension.' The Irish Marquis was, indeed, no financier, and it was with some justice that he observed: 'My practice in my own little business of that kind cannot have given any reputation to my advices in the case of another.'[3]

But, in other respects, James could have had no better or wiser counsellor, and Ormonde spared no pains to promote a more cordial feeling among the members of the royal family. Nor did his efforts stop there. Though he shared, in general, the political opinions of Hyde and Nicholas, he was too high-souled to yield to party prejudice, and he laboured to heal the royalist divisions and to reconcile the Queen with those who had offended her. His tolerance encouraged the Louvre party to claim him as one of themselves, and provoked his own friends to complain that he gave their rivals too much 'countenance,' but he adhered to his rôle of mediator with some measure of success. His natural tact and courtesy, even more than his faithful services in Ireland, had gained him Henrietta's favour, and he was able to obtain her pardon for both Taafe and Radcliffe.

[1] *Carte, Letters*, ii. pp. 41, 43. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 265.
[2] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 619.
[3] *Ibid.* xxix. fol. 647. *Carte, Letters*, ii. pp. 21, 40.

1651 Nicholas, for whom he would fain have interceded, declined his good offices, and even spoke of compounding with the English Government for some portion of his property. The honest secretary had been in dire disgrace with the Queen ever since he had opposed Charles's Scottish policy, and the results of that policy had given him no reason to change his opinions. He was convinced that he could never enjoy the Queen's confidence without betraying the King's, and he did not hesitate to attribute all royalist errors and failures to the general want of secrecy at the Louvre, and 'the busy negotiations and designs of the Queen's Court.'[1]

August Henrietta was not indifferent to this criticism: it gave an additional bitterness to Cromwell's successes in Scotland; and when the news of his subjugation of Fife reached Paris in August 1651, it was observed that the usually sanguine Queen suffered very severely from the blow.

'She is more than ordinarily troubled at this disaster,' wrote an English spy, 'taking the affairs of Scotland so much the more to heart because she hath had a peculiar influence on them, and hath been the particular actor of the King going thither, which makes the contrary faction of royalists impute all the ill-success to her.'[2]

The King's march for England, in the same month, restored the failing spirits of the exiles. Henrietta was raised from the depths of despair to the highest pinnacle of hope, and the wildest rumours of success were current at the Louvre.

'But that which rejoiceth them above all,' wrote the spy before quoted, 'is a letter written to Colonel Rooksby, the which assureth that Lancashire and all the adjacent counties come in very readily to the King, and send him abundance of men, money, and provisions.

[1] *Carte, Letters*, i. pp. 420-3; ii. pp. 42, 89. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., xv. fol. 49.

[2] *French Correspondence*, Record Office, cxiii. Paris, 9th-19th August 1651.

The which letter having been sent by the said Rooksby to the Duke of York, he did even leap for joy at the reading of it. And, as they disperse these news through all Paris, so they have a particular care to fill the French Court with them, the which is the more apt and willing to believe them, because very malignantly disposed to the Commonwealth of England, and a great enime of it. And the artifices, disguises, and confident assertions wherewith these news have been represented to the said Court, by those at the Louvre, have made such deep impressions on it, and made them apprehend ye King in so hopeful a posture as, in relation thereunto, they have resolved to send unto ye King, and have already appointed ye person that is to go to him; as being made believe thet ye King is, or very shortly will be, master of divers sea-ports and of divers counties in England, so as it will be enough for them to go hence to come at him. And yt maketh my Lord Gerard, and other English gallants here, to prepare themselves to be gone for England, for to serve ye King in that war which, they imagine, will be speedily concluded with an easy and universal victory.'[1] 1651

When these high hopes were dashed by the King's defeat at Worcester, despair succeeded to over-sanguine expectation. Many of the exiles departed at once to England, intending to make their peace with the Commonwealth. Others, whose loyalty was inviolable, confessed, none the less, that they regarded this final disaster as 'conclusive,' and Ormonde wrote to Nicholas: 'All imaginable trials for the recovery of the royal interest have been made and failed.'[2] September

But for the moment all other thoughts were lost in the 'dreadful apprehension' regarding Charles's personal safety. Rumours of his escape were plentiful. It was said, at one time, that he had come, disguised as a skipper, to Holland, and was at Teyling with his sister.

[1] *French Correspondence*, cxiii., 23rd August-2nd September 1651.
[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 276, 278. *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 459.

1651 October

Again, it was whispered that only the Queen and Lord Jermyn knew his place of concealment. In the middle of October Buckingham came to Rotterdam, and confidently asserted that Charles was safe, 'on this side the sea,' implying by his manner that 'he knew more than was fit to be spoken.' His object was to cause the cessation of the search for the fugitive King in England, and with that view all these rumours were diligently circulated by Charles's friends on the Continent; but nothing certain was known of his fate until he himself sent news to his mother of his landing at Fécamp in Normandy.[1]

Throughout these months of sorrow and anxiety the Queen-Regent of France had been unfailingly kind and considerate to her sister-in-law. She would fain have kept ill news from Henrietta, and when she found that impossible, she sought to comfort and encourage her with kind words and caresses. More she had not to give, for the distracted condition of her own state absorbed all her resources. Henrietta repaid her sympathy with a loyalty that gave fresh cause of umbrage to her English critics. They, careful of their own Sovereign's interests, and profoundly indifferent to the French troubles, would have had their Queen maintain a masterly neutrality, inclining always to the stronger side. Henrietta, as a daughter of France and a pensioner of the French Crown, conceived her duty otherwise.

1649 March

The Frondeurs of 1649 had been defeated and overthrown by Condé. In March 1649 the Peace of Rueil had been concluded between the Court and the Parliament. One by one the princes and nobles made their submission, each gained by the promise of honours or substantial rewards for himself and his friends; last of all came the Coadjutor-Archbishop and the Duc de

August

Beaufort, and on the 18th of August the Court returned, triumphant, to Paris.

[1] *Memoirs of James II.*, i. p. 52. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 29, 35. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 278.

The triumph was a brief one, for the Government was already threatened by a new and pressing danger, in the pride and ambition of its champion. The great Condé was discontented! He deemed himself insufficiently rewarded for his services; he was jealous of the House of Vendôme, and his resentment was diligently fanned by his sister, Madame de Longueville, and by the light-hearted, noisy young nobles who formed his admiring circle. Thus grew up the second Fronde, known as 'the Fronde of the Princes.' 1649 August-December

Mazarin was not ignorant of this new development, but for some months he endured Condé's insolence with patience. He flattered the Prince's insatiable vanity, conceded the demands of his ever-growing ambition, and waited for the inevitable alienation of his supporters. The waiting was not a long one, for the Prince's arrogance, his persistent aggrandisement of his personal friends, above all his bitter tongue, which spared no one, speedily made him enemies on all sides. The Queen was exasperated by his championship of the Marquis de Jarzé, who had dared to approach her as a lover. Gaston of Orléans confessed himself weary of Condé's domination. The old Fronde, insulted and neglected by its new ally, sought to establish relations with the Court, and on the 14th of January 1650 a secret treaty was signed between them. The time was now ripe for action, and on the 18th of the same month the Princes of Condé and Conti, with their brother-in-law, the Duc de Longueville, were arrested at the Palais Royal, and imprisoned in the Bois de Vincennes. 1650 January

Paris celebrated the event with bonfires, but civil war raged in the provinces. Madame de Longueville fled to Normandy and thence to Stenai, where she was joined by Turenne. The young Princesse de Condé sought refuge at Bordeaux with her little son, and roused Guienne in her husband's cause. The Comte de Marchin, who commanded the French forces in Catalonia, abandoned his post to go to her aid. La Roche-

1650 foucauld and the Tavannes raised the standard of revolt in Poitou and Burgundy. The Spaniards at the invitation of the Prince's party invaded the north of France.

March-December Mazarin contended ably and successfully with the rebellion. The vigorous action of the royal army, always supported by the presence of the King and Court, reduced each province in turn, and on the 15th of December the Royalist victories were crowned by the battle of Rhetel, which compelled the Spaniards to retreat from France.

In the hour of triumph Mazarin, weary of the greed and exigencies of the Frondeurs, believed that he could dispense with their alliance, and he discovered his error too late. The partisans of the princes had profited by the nine months' absence of the Court to intrigue with the Fronde, and by the ability and energy of Anne de Gonzague, the intimate friend of Madame de Longueville, a coalition had been formed between the two parties. The Frondeurs began to take part in the riots provoked by the Condé faction, and on the 30th of December the Parliament of Paris, inspired by the Coadjutor—who was consumed with an unconquerable jealousy of Mazarin—formally demanded the release of the princes and the banishment of the Cardinal. A

1651 January few days later a treaty was signed between Anne de Gonzague and the Duc de Nemours, acting on behalf of the princes, and the Coadjutor and Beaufort acting on behalf of the Fronde, which pledged both parties to obtain the prisoners' freedom.

It was at this juncture that Henrietta displeased Nicholas and others by what they chose to stigmatise as her 'over-pollitical practises with the Duke of Orléans.' As Gaston's favourite sister, she was supposed to have some influence with him, and she exerted herself to retain him for the Court, entreating him not to join the Fronde or to consent to the princes' release. But the ever-vacillating Gaston was just then guided by Anne

de Gonzague and the Coadjutor, and Henrietta pleaded in vain. On the 30th of January 1651 her brother appended his signature to the new treaty, and on the 4th of February he declared openly for Condé. A tumult followed. Mazarin left the city, and the King and Queen remained, to all intents and purposes, prisoners in the palace. The Regent found herself forced to sign the order for the princes' release, and on the 13th of February Mazarin, anticipating its arrival, himself set his enemies at liberty. He had hoped by this action to regain their goodwill, but Condé received his professions of friendship with laughter, and he judged it prudent to leave France. Henrietta, again acting on what Nicholas termed 'a strange and most unskilful counsel,' suggested Jersey as a suitable refuge for the exiled minister, but Mazarin declined the offer, and established himself at Brühl.[1]

1651 February

After all this it was not to be expected that Condé would regard the English Court with much favour, yet, within a week of his return, he paid 'a long and civil visit' there, and professed much interest and concern in Charles's affairs. Subsequently he became better informed of Henrietta's attitude towards him, and was said to entertain 'much kindness for the King and the Duke of York, but very little for the Queen, and none at all for Lord Jermyn.'[2]

For two months the triumphant Prince dominated Paris: the King and Queen remained, practically his prisoners, within the Palais Royal, and the wildest counsels prevailed. It was proposed to deprive the Queen, not only of the regency, but of the custody of her son, and to postpone the young King's approaching majority for several years. In this crisis Anne of Austria behaved with courage and ability. Guided always by the absent Mazarin, she set herself to sow discord between nobles, Parliament, and clergy, and to

March

[1] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. p. 293. *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 411.
[2] *Carte MSS.*, xxix. fol. 249. *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 413.

1651 April dissolve the dangerous coalition of Condé with the Fronde.

With the aid of Anne de Gonzague, who had originally formed the cabal, she succeeded perfectly. Condé, bribed by the promise of government and power, deserted Orléans, and entered into a secret understanding with the Court. In the middle of April he broke definitely with the Fronde by repudiating the treaty of marriage between his brother, Conti, and Charlotte of Lorraine. This marriage had been the basis of the alliance between the two parties: the breach thus made was irreparable, and Condé had to reckon thenceforth with the implacable enmity of the Duchesse de Chevreuse and the Coadjutor-Archbishop, the mother and lover of the slighted girl.

May-October The King and Queen were once more free to appear in the streets of Paris, but the Prince was not less ambitious than he had been before his arrest, neither had he forgiven his imprisonment, and the desire for vengeance now mingled with his ambition. His all-pervading power and exorbitant pretensions remained a standing menace to the Crown; every day his words and actions gave fresh proof of his intention to annul the royal authority, and he was suspected of still maintaining his alliance with Spain. In his later years he owned that these suspicions were not unfounded, and that he had emerged from prison 'the most guilty of men,' resolved to hesitate at nothing for the gratification of his private aims, and even meditating the dethronement of the youthful Louis XIV. Fortunately for Louis, Condé's arrogance was, like his ambition, unabated, and he proceeded as before to weary his partisans with his disdainful pride, and to wound and alienate his friends by his sarcastic habit of speech. During months of agitation and intrigue the Queen negotiated with both Frondes, playing each against the other, until at last fear of Condé induced her to ally herself with the Coadjutor, who undertook to 'dispute the pavement of Paris' with the Prince.

For several weeks the two parties contended for supremacy in the streets and in the Parliament of Paris; but while the Coadjutor was in his element, the Prince found the petty contest repugnant to his military genius. He lost ground steadily, and on the 6th of September, the day before the majority of the young King was solemnly proclaimed, he quitted the capital, in order to kindle in the provinces the third civil war of the Fronde.[1]

Such was the state of affairs in France when Charles returned thither at the end of October 1651.

[1] Chéruel's *Minorité de Louis XIV.*, iii. and iv. Cousin's *Mme. de Longueville, pendant La Fronde.*

CHAPTER XIV

Melancholy of Charles—Marriage Prospects—Mlle. de Longueville—Mlle. de Montpensier—Mme. de Châtillon—The Third War of the Fronde—Departure of James to the Army—Condition of the English in Paris—Charles mediates between the King and the Princes—Charles persuades Lorraine to retreat—Anger of the Princes—The Louvre attacked by the Mob—The Battle of St. Antoine—The Retreat of the English Court to St. Germains—The Return to Paris—The Decay of the Princes' Party—The Retreat of Lorraine and Condé—The Return of Louis XIV. to Paris—The Dispersion of the Fronde.

1651 November

THE King's return revived again the drooping spirits of the exiles. To many the defeat of the Scots was hardly a matter for regret, even the Queen was 'constantly and wonderfully merry,' and it was Charles alone who could not find it in his heart to share in the general rejoicing for his personal safety. In the first excitement of the reunion he had pretended a gaiety that he did not feel, but the effort was soon abandoned, and within a few days of his return he had sunk into the lowest depths of Stuart melancholy. 'He is very sad and sombre,' wrote an English spy, 'that cheerfulness which, against his nature, he strove to assume at his first coming having lasted but a few days, and he is very silent always.'

So profound was his silence, that when, in November, he was informed of the surrender of Jersey to the Parliament, 'he said not one word.' James, on the contrary, found comfort in the stout resistance made by the islanders, and rejoiced loudly over their valour. 'His expressions to that purpose having been judged very childish by the standers-by, as many of his words and actions are daily,' asserted the same spy.[1]

[1] *French Papers*, Record Office, cxiii. N.N. to —; 1st-11th November 1651.

Charles's depression was natural enough. His sacrifices of honour and conscience had been made in vain; his hopes were shattered; his adherents—disappointed and disheartened—were torn asunder by faction, and he was himself absolutely penniless. Little aid was to be expected from the French Court, which had already quitted Paris with the army sent to oppose Condé's levies in the south. Henrietta, suffering as she did in the French troubles, was in no case to help her son, and it was remarked that they kept between them 'a very spare house,' and a table 'indifferently furnished.'[1] Indeed, on the very night of Charles's arrival, Henrietta had been obliged to inform him that she could not feed him, and that the half of the first meal that they enjoyed together must be charged to his account. Still less could she provide him with a change of linen, and he was forced to content himself with the gift of one of Jermyn's shirts.

The Coadjutor-Archbishop, who had been so strongly moved by Henrietta's lack of a fire in 1649, felt scarcely less for the destitute condition of her son, and he endeavoured to wring from Gaston of Orléans some substantial aid for his nephew. But Gaston, never rich, and always parsimonious, refused to be moved to liberality, and Paul de Gondi, 'ashamed' for both the Duke and himself, borrowed 1500 pistoles, which he presented to Lord Taafe for the use of the English king.[2]

In the circumstances Henrietta deemed marriage to be the only resource remaining to her sons, and she therefore desired Charles to renew his courtship of Mademoiselle de Montpensier, while she selected for James's bride Marie d'Orléans, daughter of the Duc de Longueville by his first wife, and heiress, through her mother, of the house of Soissons.

Neither of the bridegrooms-elect was averse to the rôle assigned to him. Charles, tamed by misfortune,

[1] *French Papers*, Record Office, cxiii. N.N. to —; 1st-11th November 1651.
[2] *Memoirs of De Retz*, i. pp. 247-8.

1651 and 'looking too much upon the relief it might give to his present necessities,' was ready, at last, to lay aside his objections to marriage with his cousin,[1] and James had a real admiration for Marie d'Orléans, whom, he said, he would willingly have married for herself alone. The lady, on her side, was well pleased with his atten-
December tions, but the affair was ended in December by the Queen-Regent's refusal to sanction the match. Her alleged reason was its unsuitability to James's exalted rank, but it was perhaps nearer the truth that the lady's fortune was over-great to be suffered to pass from France, or that the part played by her family in the wars of the Fronde made the Court unwilling to permit her the dignity of a royal alliance. The prohibition was deeply regretted by both the persons chiefly concerned. 'The Prince was grieved by it,' says Mme. de Motteville. 'He esteemed the Princess, her virtue and her person pleased him, and her riches, as heiress of the late Comte de Soissons, would have been very welcome to him. The marriage was very suitable, both for him and for her.'

Hyde asserts, on the contrary, that the lady was, 'in respect of her person, not at all attractive, being a lady of a very low stature, and that stature in no degree straight.'[2]

He was possibly prejudiced by his sense of the dangers involved in such a marriage, though these paled before the apprehension excited in his mind by the prospect of Charles's union with his cousin of Montpensier. Ormonde was of the Chancellor's opinion in this matter, and both did their utmost to turn the King from his project. They represented to him 'that the lady was elder than he by many years, which was an exception among private persons, and had been observed not to be prosperous to Kings.' They assured him that the immediate benefits to be derived from the match would

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. 151.

[2] *Ibid.* xiii. p. 149. *De Motteville*, iv. p. 241. *Memoirs of James II.*, i. p. 54.

1651 November

be more than counterbalanced by the prejudice that would be inevitably excited in England by his marriage with a member of the Roman Church, and 'they besought him to set his heart entirely on the recovery of England, and to indulge to nothing that might reasonably obstruct that.'

Charles replied that he had nothing else in view, that he intended to devote the whole of his cousin's fortune to that object, and that he was confident she would offer no obstruction of any kind to his restoration.

'In a word, his Majesty discovered enough to let them see that he stood very well-inclined to the overture itself, which gave them trouble, as a thing which, in many respects, was like to prove very inconvenient.'[1]

The moment seemed favourable for the prosecution of Charles's suit. Curiosity had brought the French nobility to the Louvre 'very fast'; the King found himself 'strangely admiered and visitted'; and among the first of his visitors were his uncle Gaston and his cousin Anne-Marie-Louise de Montpensier.[2]

Mademoiselle did not adorn herself on this occasion, but went unceremoniously to her aunt's Court, *sans être coiffée*. Henrietta received her alone, and, anxious to prepare her niece for the worst, assured her that she would find Charles 'very ridiculous,' since he had been obliged to cut off his hair, and was still dressed 'in an extraordinary fashion.' The warning was not needed, for when the King entered the room his cousin observed in him only a change for the better. Lady Fanshaw, and those who, like her, had known Charles from childhood, lamented that he had, during the past year, grown strangely coarse in feature and reckless of expression, but Mademoiselle saw only the improvement in his manner. She had always admired his fine figure and curly black hair, and to these natural advantages he now

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 152.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 280. *Mercurius Politicus*, 3rd November 1651. *French Papers*, Record Office, cxiii., 1st-11th November 1651.

added 'la meilleure mine du monde, douce, civile, galante.' Better still, he spoke French with perfect ease and fluency, which appeared to his cousin a strange but very satisfactory result of his absence from France. He exerted himself to please her, and succeeded well. The story he told of his recent adventures charmed her; his description of the 'miserable life' he had led in Scotland astonished her. There was not, he declared, so much as one woman in his Court there, and the people were so 'uncivilised' as to consider it sinful to take pleasure in music; in short, he had been 'furiously bored.'

Later, as he led his cousin back to the Tuileries, through the long gallery that communicated with the Louvre, he added softly that he had been more than half consoled for his defeat by his return to France, which he found so delightful, and where he had so many friends; and he asked eagerly when dancing would begin at Court. 'He appeared to me a timid and diffident lover, who dared not say all he felt,' says Mademoiselle, 'and who preferred that I should believe him indifferent to his misfortunes, rather than weary me by talking of them. For, to other people, he did not speak of the joy he felt at being in France, nor of his desire to dance.'[1]

In truth, Charles felt no joy at his return to exile, and had very little heart for dancing; but his sojourn in Scotland had taught him more than the French language. The shy, silent boy had become a man, silent still by nature, but skilled in the art of dissembling, and able to rouse himself from his habitual taciturnity when occasion made it worth his while. Disappointed in the hope of recovering his Crown, he had resolved to marry his wealthy cousin, and he showed himself well able to amuse her and to play the part of a devoted lover. He was careful to seek her society daily, and to take part in all her amusements.

[1] *Montpensier*, i. pp. 320-1. *Portraits de Mademoiselle*, p. 14.

'The King of Scots, the Duke of York, the Duke of Beaufort, and Mademoiselle d'Orléans are much given to hunting, dancing, balls, and masking,' reported a spy of the Commonwealth. 'The great kindness, the frequent visits and revels that pass between him (the King) and Mlle. d'Orléans, minister to all men large occasion of discourse, as if there were an intent of marriage that way, . . . he being now, of late, become a great pretender to wit and jesting among the ladies.'[1] 1651-1652

Charles enjoyed, throughout the winter, exceptional opportunities of meeting his cousin. The absence of the Queen and the illness of the Duchess of Orléans had left Mademoiselle the greatest lady in Paris, and she kept a very gay Court, holding assemblies every evening between the hours of five and nine. Thither came Charles with great regularity, often accompanied by his mother. On one occasion Henrietta brought both her sons, unbidden, to supper with her niece, a surprise which caused their hostess some chagrin, in that she would fain have offered them better fare. After supper they played at games—*des petits jeux*—of which the Stuarts were very fond, and which Mademoiselle found so amusing that she resolved to introduce them at her assemblies.

Charles, who continued to speak French very well, pressed his suit with considerable energy, gazed incessantly at his cousin, and even made her the tender speeches for which she had formerly looked in vain. His trouble was, however, wasted; for, though the dream of marriage with the Emperor was over, Mademoiselle had now a new scheme in her head. She had conceived the 'unreasonable' idea of marrying the young Louis of France; 'by which means,' says James severely, 'reaching at what she could not get, she lost what it was in her power to have had.'[2] That she was eleven years the

[1] *Mercurius Politicus*, 5th-15th November 1651.

[2] *Memoirs*, i. p. 53.

1651-1652 French King's senior appeared to her no obstacle, and she did not lack friends to aid her design, for the Princess Palatine, Anne de Gonzague, had interested herself in the affair.

The intrigue was kept a secret, but, by some means, Henrietta obtained knowledge of it, and thereupon demanded a definite answer to her son's suit. Mademoiselle pleaded that she was too happy in her present condition to think of marriage at all. Henrietta retorted that Charles's affection would make her the happiest woman in the world; assured her that the alliance would work wonders for the Restoration, of which there was even then a good prospect; and concluded with a promise that the bride-elect should in any case remain mistress of her own fortune, the King and his train living, as before, on what they could draw from England or France. Finding that her niece remained unmoved, Henrietta then spoke plainly of the projected marriage with Louis, and demanded a promise that, if this failed, Mademoiselle would content herself with Charles.

The much harassed heiress denied having cherished any designs on Louis, and, trusting in her father's rooted aversion to see her married, referred her aunt to him. Gaston, in his turn, referred the question to the French Queen, remarking that his daughter was the property of the State—a view perfectly satisfactory to Henrietta and Charles, who knew that the Queen-mother favoured their cause.

Charles hastened at once to his cousin's rooms to report to her Gaston's 'favourable' reply, and poured out voluble compliments; protesting, amongst other things, that he should desire his restoration more ardently than ever, for the sake of a wife who would double all his happiness by sharing it with him.

The lady returned, rather scornfully, that he was not likely to recover his kingdoms unless he visited them in person, and that speedily. Upon which Charles exclaimed indignantly: 'What! you would wish me to

leave you as soon as I have married you.' His cousin 1652
answered with spirit: 'Yes, for in that case I should be more obliged than I am to take your interests to heart; and it would pain me to see you dancing the tricotet and amusing yourself, when instead you should either get knocked on the head or replace your crown upon it, of which you would be unworthy if you would not go to seek it at the point of the sword and the peril of your life.'

There the conversation ended, and Charles withdrew, feeling, no doubt, somewhat aggrieved. But, a few days later, Mademoiselle was taken ill, and her suitor came daily to see her, inquiring after her with intense solicitude.

She found herself more hardly pressed than ever. Even her last defence, the plea of religion, seemed to be failing her, for her friends urged upon her the duty of effecting Charles's conversion, and prevailed with her so far that she actually broached the subject to him. He replied that he would 'do all things' for her, but should expect, in return for his sacrifice, a definite promise of marriage. This came to the knowledge of the Court, and the Duchesse d'Aiguillon, a devout lady of the Queen's party, pressed Mademoiselle 'horribly' to marry the English King, assuring her that she would be held responsible before God for the salvation of his soul. After the Duchess came the Abbé Montague on the same errand, but both failed to impress the heiress as they desired. She suspected shrewdly that their pious zeal masked more worldly motives, and that the Court, dissatisfied with Gaston's conduct, would fain have ruined him, *en toutes façons*, by depriving him of his daughter's fortune and providing him at the same time with a son-in-law who could be of no service to him.

Moreover, there were not wanting counsellors on the other side who warned her that all her wealth could not suffice to restore her lover to England, that she would

1652 certainly 'die of starvation' if she married him, and that, in the meanwhile, his courtship was injuring her reputation abroad.

Actuated by this last consideration, she grew cold to her suitor, and expressed a wish, through Jermyn, that he would visit her less frequently. Charles was deeply offended; for three weeks he did not enter her presence, and, when next she met him at the Louvre, she found his manner towards her totally changed. He had heretofore waived the privileges of his rank whenever he found himself in his cousin's society, but on this occasion he took his seat in the arm-chair to which etiquette entitled him, and was careful to maintain his regal dignity throughout the interview. Mademoiselle pretended indifference, but the question of seats was a vital one at the French Court, and she felt the slight very severely. Nor did the ease with which her rejected lover consoled himself tend to soothe her wounded vanity.[1]

The lady to whom Charles now turned gladly enough was Isabelle-Angélique de Montmorency, a cousin of Condé on his mother's side, and widow of that Prince's friend Gaspard de Coligny, Duc de Châtillon. In an age of beautiful and charming women, she was distinguished for her beauty and charm; and her own description of her personal attractions is not belied by her existing portrait, nor by the testimony of her contemporaries. Her tall, slight figure, the perfect oval of her face, her regular features, fair complexion, auburn hair, and soft brown eyes fascinated all beholders, while her manner and conversation were no less alluring.

The young husband whom she had once adored had perished in the Fronde of 1649, and she now counted among her lovers, besides Charles himself, Condé, the Duc de Nemours, the Abbé Fouquet, Crofts, and Digby. The passion of the eccentric Digby was as violent as were most emotions from which he suffered, and he courted her after a romantic fashion, on which none less

[1] *Montpensier Memoirs*, i. pp. 319-35.

'accustomed to extraordinary flights in the air' could have ventured. 1652

'It would have indeed, in some countries, have seemed a very odd passage,' wrote Hyde to Nicholas.

Yet even the decorous Hyde described the object of Digby's passion with such rapture as suggests that he himself had not been altogether scathless. She was, he said, 'a lady of great beauty, of a presence very graceful and alluring, and a wit and behaviour that captivated all who were admitted to her presence.' He attributes to her also modesty, virtue, and wisdom in an equal degree; but a more competent judge, Madame de Motteville, deemed her false, affected, ambitious, and thoroughly unscrupulous.[1]

In fact, the ruling passion of this fascinating lady was avarice, and she did not hesitate to gratify it at the expense of her aspiring lovers.

From the romantic Digby—then a lieutenant-general of the French army and high in Mazarin's favour—she won large sums at cards. And she also induced him to betray to her secrets of state which she betrayed again to the rebellious princes. She wrung from Condé the gift of his country-house at Merlou, while she obtained presents and favours from the Court by detaining him in Paris to the ruin of his army. She favoured the Prince by policy but Nemours by inclination, and her fascination was only equalled by her callousness and by the skill with which she played one lover against another.

Such was the woman whose smiles had consoled Charles in earlier years for his cousin's coldness, and whom he was now willing to make his wife. Mademoiselle in her vanity refused to believe him 'capable of such a thing,' and declared that the Duchess merely amused herself with his capture in order to relieve the *ennui* caused her by Nemours's absence with the army. But the King was infatuated, the lady ambitious, and it

[1] *De Motteville*, iv. p. 365. *Portraits de Mademoiselle*, p. 472. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fol. 135. *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 96.

is certain that both seriously entertained the thought of marriage. The affair was promoted by Digby and Crofts, who, convinced that their own suit was hopeless, had confided in one another, and entered into a compact to marry the object of their adoration to their master. At their instigation, Charles made her a formal offer of his hand, which she received with an air of modest reluctance, 'declaring herself to be much unworthy of that grace, and . . . using all those arguments for refusal that might inflame him to new importunities.' She proceeded to inquire whether she would be received at Court as Queen of England in the event of her marriage, to which question Anne of Austria replied coldly that her treatment would depend wholly on Henrietta's wishes.

Digby then strove to enlist the Chancellor in the cause. He pointed out to him how greatly the King was 'transported' with his passion. He 'magnified the lady as a person that would exceedingly cultivate the King's nature.' And he dwelt long on the value of her personal influence, which would, he averred, secure many friends and allies to her husband. But Hyde, notwithstanding his admiration for Madame de Châtillon, could not see in her a suitable match for his Sovereign. He exerted all his influence on the other side, and Charles, after some reflection and consultation with his friends, decided to let the matter drop. This recalcitrance was attributed by the injured lady solely to the machinations of Henrietta, and she ceased, from that time forth, to visit the exiled Queen.

1654 July

Yet, so long as Charles remained in Paris, Digby and Crofts refused to despair; and, when he quitted that country in 1654, they easily persuaded him to pay a farewell visit to the Duchess. Having sent his train on in advance Charles went secretly to Merlou, where he passed the night of the 10th of July. Thither the two schemers followed him, and there they made a last effort to compass their design. The attempt proved vain, and

the King went on his way next day, possessed, so Hyde asserts, 'with a great esteem of the lady's virtue and wisdom.' But his 'small step out of the way' speedily became known in Paris, where it 'administered much occasion of discourse,' and 'raised a confident rumour that he was married to that lady.'[1] 1654 July

While the Courts of the Louvre and the Tuileries were occupied with balls, plays, fêtes, and matrimonial projects, France had been plunged again into all the horrors of civil war. Condé had quitted Paris in September, intending to confine the coming struggle to the borders of the Loire, thus sparing his southern adherents, who had already suffered sufficiently in his cause. The prompt action of the King and Queen frustrated this design. On the 27th of September they followed the Prince with a hastily gathered army, and Condé, finding himself obliged to fight seasoned troops with raw recruits, retreated before them. By the last day of October the Court was established at Poitiers, and before the end of November all Poitou was reduced to obedience. 1651 September October

Condé then made strenuous efforts to secure foreign allies, and despatched emissaries to England, Spain, and the Duke of Lorraine. England, eager to stir up trouble for France among the Huguenots of the south, had long desired to join the Fronde. But the agent sent by Cromwell to Bordeaux found the Huguenots for the most part loyal and contented, the Frondeurs hopelessly 'frivolous and boastful.' Moreover, all England's energies were concentrated on the struggle with Holland, and she therefore lent a favourable ear to the envoys sent by Mazarin to counteract Condé's intrigues. Lorraine also was deterred from coming to Condé's aid by the wiles of the Cardinal, but Spain proved more propitious to the rebels; and, in return for her promises, Condé admitted a Spanish garrison to Bourg on the November

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. pp. 95-7. *Montpensier*, i. p. 324; iii. p. 158. Cousin's *Madame de Longueville*, pp. 74, 139. Chéruel's *France sous Mazarin*, i.

1651 December — Dordogne. In consequence of this, he and his friends were formally proclaimed traitors on the 4th of December by the Parliament of Paris.

1652 January — The return of Mazarin in January produced a reaction in the Prince's favour. The Cardinal, having carefully secured the northern frontier, had traversed Champagne victoriously, and on the 29th of January rejoined the Court at Poitiers. The Bourgeoisie of Paris received the news with equanimity, but the Parliament and the Orléans party gave way to hysterical fury. The Cardinal was again proscribed, a price was set on his head, and his books and valuables were seized and sold. Gaston, who had hitherto hesitated in his course, now openly threw in his lot with Condé, and entered into a treaty with him never to lay down arms until Mazarin had been expelled from France.

February — In the following month Turenne offered his services to the King, and received the command of half the royal army, the other half being confided to the Maréchal d'Hocquincourt. On the 22nd of February Condé gained a slight success at Agen, but the Royalists steadily pursued their conquest of Central France, and the insurgents found themselves forced back on Guienne.

March — The King was thus free to march against the army of Gaston, which was established on the Loire under the command of the Duc de Beaufort. By the middle of March the lower Loire was successfully reduced, and the Royalists advanced on the city of Orléans, which had, so far, maintained a wholly neutral attitude. Mademoiselle, perceiving the danger of its surrender, urged her father to go to the rescue of his city; but Gaston, vacillating as usual, declared himself unwell, and refused to stir. His daughter thereupon took the matter into her own hands, joined Beaufort's army before Orléans, and demanded admittance to the city. She was received with royal honours; the insurgent generals were permitted to enter with their officers, and the gates were closed against the King.

Mademoiselle was delighted with her exploit, but the triumph was marred for her party by the dissensions of Beaufort and his brother-in-law Nemours, who had joined him with reinforcements from Condé. At the Council held within the city Nemours gave Beaufort the lie; the other resented the insult with a blow, and the quarrel culminated, some months later, in the death of Nemours at the hands of his brother-in-law. The efficiency of the army was, meanwhile, seriously injured by the mutual hatred of its commanders, who could not at the best have competed successfully with Turenne. The Frondeurs lost ground on the Loire, as they had already done further south. The condition of Paris grew daily more perilous, and the rebels called loudly on Condé to come and save them. 1652

Condé came. Confiding Guienne to the care of his brother and sister, he left Agen on the 23rd of March, and reached the camp of the Fronde at Lorris on April 1st, after a wonderful ride, during which he never changed his horse, or halted for more than two hours at a time. On the night of April 7th he defeated Hocquincourt at Bleneau; on the 11th he entered Paris, and on the following day he visited the Parliament. Contrary to his expectation, he was received with fierce reproaches, and he thereupon set himself to win over the mob to his side. April

To effect this he used every device calculated to please the popular fancy; he distributed alms lavishly in the streets, and took pains to display a degree of religious fervour not usual with him. His plan succeeded perfectly. 'Ah, le bon prince! et qu'il est dévot!' cried the people when they beheld him, rosary in hand, passionately kissing the image of St. Geneviève, and they remained his devoted admirers. But it was the mob and army alone that supported the prince. The Parliament was dominated by the old Fronde; the Coadjutor, hating Condé, intrigued to detach Gaston from his party, while the magistrates and better class of citizens longed only for

peace and the King's return. Famine and sedition reigned in the city; the shops were closed, all business was suspended, food could be obtained only at fabulous prices, the people perished in the streets, and the outbreak of pestilence seemed imminent.[1]

The English exiles were not without their share in the general suffering. Neither Charles nor Henrietta had received the pensions on which they and their trains depended, their poverty was extreme, and their known loyalty to the French Crown put them in danger of the popular violence. This danger was enhanced by the departure of James, who had at last obtained his brother's permission to take service in the royal army. Provided with a small sum of money, borrowed from a Gascon, and with some Polish horses which had been sent as a present to Charles, the young Duke left Paris secretly, and joined Turenne before Chartres on the 24th of April 1652. For the next four years he served with honour and reputation in the French army, winning for himself the personal friendship of many of his brother-officers, and in particular that of the great Turenne, while he escaped much of the trouble and humiliation that beset his mother and brother in Paris.

The English King and Queen had remained at the Louvre, 'not knowing whither to go, nor well able to stay there'; and, when the royal army advanced on Paris, 'the loose people of the town began to talk of the Duke of York being in arms against them.'[2] The rage of the populace was, however, held in check by Condé and Orléans, who preserved a friendly attitude towards their English relatives, and took pains to show them such civility as the circumstances would permit. Their kindness placed Charles in an awkward dilemma,

[1] *France sous Mazarin*, vol. i. *passim*. *Madame de Longueville, pendant La Fronde*, passim. *Motteville*, iv. p. 333.

[2] *Memoirs of James II.*, i. pp. 54-6. *Clarendon, History*, xiii. pp. 122, 123, 143.

but he finally avoided the necessity of returning their visits by leaving town on the pretext of hunting. 1652 April

Such service as he could legitimately do them he was ready to perform, and in April he consented to be the bearer of their overtures to the King. With this purpose he visited Louis at Corbeil, but the negotiation failed in consequence of the Princes' extravagant demands and obstinate refusal to treat with the Cardinal. Condé's attempt to negotiate privately through Madame de Châtillon proved equally abortive, and earned for him the bitter hatred of the Orléans party, who regarded him thenceforth as a traitor to the cause.

The success of the Royalists continued steadily. On the 4th of May Turenne defeated Gaston's forces, and drove them behind the walls of Etampes, to which he laid siege. St. Denys, which had been taken by Condé on the 10th of May, was retaken by the King two days later; Paris, in a paroxysm of fear, clamoured for peace, and the contending parties, both anxious to conciliate the city, withdrew their armies from its immediate neighbourhood and reopened the treaty. Charles was again chosen as mediator, but though both sides lacked all necessaries of war save only 'courage and animosity,' and both would gladly have ended the struggle, their mutual distrust made it impossible to bring the affair to a satisfactory conclusion. May

'They have deceived each other so often that neither dares believe the other's promises,' averred Hyde.[1]

At this juncture a new element was introduced into the general discord, in the person of the Duke of Lorraine. After long vacillation he had at last been bribed by Spain to march to the relief of Etampes, and, at Mazarin's request, Jermyn and Wilmot were sent to meet him and bribe him to retreat. The Duke received the English envoys in his usual fashion, and they were obliged to return with a message which Hyde described as 'so

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 65, 69, 72.

1652 June general an answer . . . that it is impossible, without a volume, to give an account of it.'[1]

Lorraine was, however, so far influenced by the Cardinal's offers that he considerably retarded his march, and contrived to spend a whole month in traversing Champagne. Thus it was not until Saturday, June 1st, that he reached Paris, where he was eagerly welcomed by the Princes. But their joy was speedily turned to disappointment. Throughout the next week their eccentric ally remained at the Luxembourg, conversing lightly with his sister, Gaston's wife, and exerting himself to amuse Mademoiselle, but sedulously avoiding any conference with Gaston or Condé, 'for fear of concluding something!' Worse still, he displayed no anxiety for the advance of his army, which he had left at some distance north of Paris. Condé complained bitterly to Mademoiselle that the Lorrainers marched only two leagues a day; but, when she tried to open the subject with the Duke, he put her off with vague protestations of his good intentions. Pressed by his sister and brother-in-law for a more definite answer, he began to sing to himself, and finally to dance in such a manner that, despite their anger, they were constrained to laugh. Gaston then endeavoured to induce him to confer with the Coadjutor, but he only asked for a rosary, remarking, 'One must pray with priests!' An attempt to confront him with the Duchesses of Montbazon and Chevreuse failed in like manner; for, on their entrance, he caught up a guitar, saying, 'Let us dance, ladies; it will become you better than to talk of politics.' And when an officer from Etampes assured him that he could soon reach the besieged city by marching day and night, he exclaimed, in feigned astonishment, 'What! does one march by night in this country?'

On the sixth day he rejoined his army at Villeneuve, but when the Princes and Mademoiselle visited his camp, in the hope of seeing his troops cross the Seine, he cast

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 69. *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 300, 301.

himself upon the ground, declaring that he was 'dying,' and must needs be bled. At last, to pacify them, he caused four regiments to pass over his bridge of boats, but these he recalled as soon as his visitors had left him.[1]

In short, Charles of Lorraine proved himself, as Hyde observed, 'a very dexterous man,' or, as another Englishman phrased it, 'a very strange companion,' and there was nothing to be done but to await his good pleasure.[2] He had, in truth, little desire to aid Condé, who held some of his estates, and against whom his sister had uttered bitter complaints. Moreover, his army was all that the exiled Duke possessed in the world, and it was his constant study to keep it from danger and loss. Therefore, while he amused his allies with facile promises, he was secretly negotiating with Charles, Jermyn, and Montagu, and on June 6th he signed a treaty by which he pledged himself not to interfere with Turenne before Tuesday, June 11th. If the town of Etampes had not surrendered by that date Turenne was to raise the siege, and Lorraine would thereupon withdraw from French territory.

The town held out beyond the appointed day, and Turenne duly raised the siege, but Lorraine showed no disposition to depart. He remained in Paris, indulging in his wonted buffoonery, for the benefit of Gaston, Beaufort, and Mademoiselle, while his men pillaged the environs of the city, and Condé strove to appease the angry citizens. It was evident that the Duke intended to continue living on the country, and it became necessary to compel his retreat. Turenne therefore advanced his army to Villeneuve, and threatened to attack if the Lorrainers did not at once retire. Charles, at the same time, received a letter from his cousin Louis, dated from Melun, on the 14th of June, and entreating him to bring Lorraine to the Court:

'MONSIEUR MON FRÈRE' (it ran),—'Ayant recognu

[1] *Montpensier*, ii. pp. 73-9.
[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 75. *Thurloe*, ii. p. 618.

(*sic*) que vous désirez passionément la paix générale . . . je vous fais cette lettre pour vous prier de vous donner la peine de venir jusques icy dès demain, et prenant le chemin par le camp de mon dit frère (le Duc de Lorraine) le conjurer de faire le mesme voiage. J'espère que Dieu bénira nos bons intentions, et qu'après y avoir travaillé si longtemps nous parviendrons à la conclusion de la paix si désirée. . . Je n'écrerais pas avec la liberté que je fais, si je n'estais pas asseuré que vous la trouverez bon.—Je suis votre bien bon frère, LOUIS.'[1]

In spite of the dissuasions of his mother, who counselled him not to meddle with the affairs of the faithless Duke, Charles hastened to comply with his young cousin's request, and at once took coach for Villeneuve, 'not so much as staying to change his clothes.'

Lorraine, though 'much discomposed' by the vicinity of the royal army, had not the least intention of accompanying Charles to Melun, but he hailed his arrival as a useful pretext for requesting Turenne to delay his attack. In the meantime he prepared for battle, and sent to Paris for reinforcements, which speedily joined him under the command of Beaufort.

The situation caused Charles some agitation of mind. 'It was not consisting with his reputation when there was a sudden prospect of battle to withdraw without having his share in the honour of it, but which side he was to take was a matter of no small consideration.' He could not well take part against Lorraine, whose guest he was, and to whom he owed many obligations. Still less could he fight against the King of France, since he was, at that very moment, under his protection, and 'by his permission in his country; besides which he had a pension from him, which was the only visible support he had.'

While he debated these things in his mind, his brother James arrived with Turenne's reply to Lorraine's message, which was simply a demand that the Duke should abandon his bridge over the Seine, quit France in fifteen days,

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliii. fol. 141.

and promise never again to aid the Princes. In return for this Turenne undertook that the retreating troops should be fed until they had passed the French borders. Charles protested that he could never induce Lorraine to consent to such terms.

'It must then be decided by the sword!' returned James. Lorraine joined the brothers at that moment, and received Turenne's message in his ordinary way of raillery, though it struck the youthful envoy that his manner was somewhat forced. Finally Jermyn accompanied James to the Royalist camp, in the hope of procuring some abatement of terms, but Turenne stood to his first demands, and James declined to bear any further message to Lorraine, on the ground that the advance of the army would be his general's best argument.

Charles thereupon flew to Turenne, who still refused to yield a single point, but consented to send his ultimatum in writing. Lorraine received the missive while he was superintending his artillery, and, having perused it, at once gave the word to fire. The order was disobeyed, as he had secretly arranged should happen, and he seized the excuse to yield and sign the required promises. Beaufort and his men were permitted to return to Paris, and, in less than an hour, the retreat of the Lorrainers began.[1]

Charles, after inspecting Turenne's army, took a friendly farewell of Lorraine and returned to Paris, where he found himself become an object of bitter detestation. Beaufort, enraged by the defection of his ally, for which he deemed Charles responsible, had flown back to the capital, and roused the fury of the populace against the exiles. The English King ought, he declared, 'to be thrown into the water, bound hand and foot,' and his angry partisans fully concurred in the sentiment.[2] Gaston complained loudly that his sister had made him an ill

[1] *James II. Memoirs*, i. pp. 81-90. De Retz's *Memoirs*, ii. p. 181. De Motteville's *Memoirs*, iv. p. 335.

[2] Chéruel, i. p. 202.

return for all his affectionate kindness towards her. Condé recalled the respect that he had always shown to his English relatives, and was not ashamed to cast up against them the pecuniary aid which they had received from himself and his mother. In the circumstances, said the Princes, Charles should, at the least, have remained neutral, and he had, by his action, 'failed in love, kinship, and self-interest, all at once.' Mademoiselle was of the same opinion, and did not hesitate to reproach Henrietta with Charles's conduct as *pas fort honorable*. The Queen retorted with taunts concerning the affair of Orléans, saying, in sarcastic allusion to Charles's unsuccessful wooing, that her niece was truly a second Pucelle, for had she not begun her career *à chasser les Anglais*? Thenceforth Mademoiselle ceased to visit the English Court and held herself, like Gaston and Condé, coldly aloof, while threats were uttered and libellous pamphlets were scattered broadcast against the English King and Queen. 'One is not master of the words of the people, nor can one prevent them from saying all that comes into their heads,' she observed complacently.

It was no longer safe for an Englishman to show himself in the streets, and for nearly a month the whole Court remained prisoners within the Louvre, besieged day and night by an angry mob, which cried out that the exiles had sought to ruin France, even as they had already ruined England.[1]

'All the rabble of London, when they went highest, was not worthy to be named with this people, who will burn, kill, or slay all that oppose them,' wrote Hyde.[2]

Nevertheless the peace party gained strength steadily and the violence of the Princes' partisans accelerated rather than retarded its growth.

On the 25th of June the refusal of the Parliament to enter into a close alliance with the insurgents provoked a riot, of which Beaufort was suspected to be the author,

[1] *Montpensier*, ii. pp. 82, 84. *De Motteville*, iv. p. 335.
[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 77, 80.

and which resulted in considerable loss of life. The Presidents of Parliament thereupon left Paris, and four days later the Royalists won the gratitude of the capital by sending bread to the starving people. On the 2nd of July Condé suffered a severe defeat in the Faubourg St. Antoine, and his army was only saved from annihilation by the devotion and energy of Mademoiselle. Gaston, excusing himself as usual on the plea of illness, would have left his ally to perish, nor could the tearful entreaties of his daughter avail to rouse him from his apathy. That intrepid lady was therefore fain to act on her own responsibility. Filled with shame for her father and anxiety for Condé, she sought the Hôtel de Ville, and wrung from the city magistrates permission to open the gates to the defeated army. Hastening on to the Port St. Antoine, she herself delivered the order and witnessed the retreat, speaking words of encouragement and sympathy to the wounded and disheartened soldiers. Finally she proceeded to the Bastille and commanded the governor to turn his guns upon the royal army, thus forfeiting her cherished hope of becoming Queen of France. 1652 July

'*Corpo di Bacco!*' cried Mazarin, when he heard the firing, 'that cannon-shot has killed her husband!'

For the moment Condé was saved, but though the presence of his demoralised army within the city walls seemed at the first to strengthen his position, it served in reality to hasten his ruin.

Two days after the battle the municipal authorities repudiated the alliance of the Princes, and resolved to recall the King. Condé revenged himself by conniving at an attack on the Hôtel de Ville, in which some thirty counsellors were murdered. The rest were besieged within the burning building until midnight, and were rescued at last by Mademoiselle, who compelled Beaufort to accompany her to the scene of action, and to use his influence on the side of peace and humanity.

This act of violence was, in fact, the final blow to the

1652 Princes' cause, but they believed their triumph assured, and immediately appointed a new municipality and a new council of government, thus arrogating all authority to themselves and their partisans.[1]

It was at this juncture that the English Court resolved to leave Paris. A further stay in a city which had thrown off all pretence of loyalty to the Crown was consistent with neither honour nor safety, but the attempt to escape was attended with so much danger, that it was deferred from day to day. Even at the last moment, when the baggage and furniture had been secretly despatched by night, and the exiles held themselves ready to start at dawn, a message from Mademoiselle warned them to postpone their journey. They lingered for several days, in ever increasing discomfort, but at last the friendly darkness of a stormy evening enabled them to set forth. Charles rode through the streets resting his hand upon the door of his mother's coach, in order to protect her from insult or violence, and thus they reached the city gates in safety. There, contrary to their expectation, they found Gaston and Condé waiting to take leave of them, and, thanks to this courtesy, they made their exit without difficulty. At some distance from the capital they were met by the King's troops, carrying torches, and thus escorted they arrived at St. Germains about midnight on Saturday, July the 13th.

September There they remained for two months in comparative quiet and safety, but towards the end of September the return of the French Court to St. Germains made it necessary for the English to find quarters elsewhere. Both Hyde and Ormonde declared it 'madness' to return to Paris before peace had been made, but the Princes sent passes 'with some circumstances of civility,' and it was decided to take the risk. The return to the Louvre was effected without adventure, and Gaston immediately sought a reconciliation with his sister.

[1] *Montpensier*, ii. pp. 91-110. *De Motteville*, iv. p. 341. Chéruel, *France sous Mazarin*, i. *passim*.

Charles thereupon visited his cousin, but he found her 1652
at her toilet engaged in conversation with Condé, and the interview terminated after a few formal speeches.[1]

The Princes' party was, by that time, in the last stage of decay. The Bourgeoisie had refused them money, their unpaid troops deserted daily, and the Parliament had withdrawn at the King's summons to Pontoise. In August Lorraine had returned, regardless of his treaty with Turenne, but he did nothing for his allies, and the presence of his wild troops merely aggravated the impatient disgust of the Parisians. In September Condé's misfortunes culminated in a severe illness which paralysed his energies during several weeks. The Royalists, grown strong and bold, formally invited the October
King's return, and on the 13th October Lorraine began his second retreat towards Flanders. A few days later Condé followed, with the remnants of his army; but his reputation was gone, his attempt to raise Champagne and Artois failed signally, and he was forced back to the Spanish Netherlands, where he entered the service of Spain.

On the 21st of October Louis returned to Paris victorious, and the dispersion of the Frondeurs followed rapidly. Beaufort fled; Gaston and his daughter retired to their country-houses; the Coadjutor—then become Cardinal de Retz—continued his intrigues for a little longer, but was arrested in December, and sent prisoner to Nantes. In February 1653 Mazarin himself was received by the fickle populace with acclamation, and, at the end of July, the wars of the Fronde were terminated by the submission of Bordeaux.[2]

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 83. *Montpensier*, ii. pp. 171-2.
[2] *France sous Mazarin*, i. ii. *passim*.

CHAPTER XV

The Policy of Mazarin—He sends a Resident to England—Remonstrance of Charles—The Irish desert from Spain—The Earl of Norwich's Mission to Brussels and the Hague—The Duke of Lorraine—Condé—Spain—Charles sends an Ambassador to the Diet—Money Granted to Charles by the Diet—Failure in Payment—Proposed Embassy to Rome—Hopes from the Dutch—Mynheer Borell—Charles's offers to the States—His Appeal to Denmark—Internal Divisions of the Dutch—Charles's Appeals to Princess Mary—The Treaty of England and the United Provinces—Denmark included in it—Sweden treats with England—Abdication of Queen Christina—Portugal—France treats with England—Charles left without an Ally.

1652 November

THE Stuarts had deserved well of the French Crown, and in November Louis and the Queen-Mother paid a formal visit to the Palais Royal, when, 'in abundance of ceremony,' they thanked Charles 'for that great pains he had taken in labouring the healing up of those sad breaches between his Majesty and his people.'[1]

But there their gratitude ended, and if the exiles looked for some more public recognition as the reward of their faithfulness, they were doomed to disappointment.

So far an armed neutrality had existed between France and the English Commonwealth which had inclined obviously to the side of Spain and the French rebels. But France, weakened by internal dissensions and the long war with Spain, had no wish to face a new foe, and it had long been Mazarin's endeavour to deprive the Spaniards of their formidable ally. In the autumn

[1] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 269, note.

CARDINAL MAZARIN.

From the engraving by Van Schupen in the British Museum, after the portrait by Mignard.

of 1651 he had sent emissaries to England in order to frustrate the machinations of Condé's agents there, and had actually obtained from Cromwell an offer of alliance in exchange for the cession of Dunkirk. The price was too high; the offer was made and withdrawn several times between October 1651 and April 1652, and on each occasion Mazarin's agent was obliged to retire on the ground of lacking credentials since the French Crown could not yet bring itself to accredit him as to a Sovereign State. In the meantime the Spanish Ambassador at London, Don Alonso de Cardenas, had made a counter offer of aiding the English to take Calais in return for their assistance in the capture of Dunkirk. 1652

The English Council of State decided to accept this overture, and on the 14th of September 1652 Blake fell on the French fleet, without any declaration of war, and completely defeated it. Dunkirk, thus deprived of the expected relief, surrendered two days later to the Spaniards. September

The result of this irregular action was not such as might have been anticipated. France expostulated and demanded satisfaction, but she could not afford to declare war, and became only the more anxious to make terms with England.

In December 1652 it was therefore decided to send a new envoy to London, Antoine de Bordeaux, who was charged to make a commercial treaty between the two countries, and to obtain satisfaction for the damage done by English vessels to the French fleet and to French trade. Bordeaux was accredited not as Ambassador, but as Resident, and his principal duties were to watch over and frustrate the intrigues of Condé and Spain in London, but his appointment none the less constituted a formal recognition of the Commonwealth, and filled Charles and Henrietta with dismay. December

This was a misfortune which they had long dreaded, and on the first rumour of it they hastened to remonstrate with Mazarin and the Queen. Their remonstrance

1652 was vain, and though the Cardinal assured them that his action was merely intended to force Holland into an alliance with France, they were not deceived.[1]

'Je vous avoue que depuis mon grand malheur je n'ai rien ressenti à l'égal de ceci,' Henrietta wrote sadly to her second son. 'Dieu nous prenne dans sa sainte protection et nous donne la patience qu'il faut avoir pour supporter ce coup.'[2]

For the time being she advised James to ignore the matter altogether. As for Charles he would, of course, be obliged to leave France.

But England had entered on a double intrigue with France and Spain, from which she could hardly extricate herself with honour. Moreover, Cromwell could not divest himself of the erroneous idea that the French Huguenots needed his protection, nor could he desist from futile efforts to rouse them to rebellion, by which he was himself preparing the way for the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Mazarin therefore was in no haste to part with the Stuarts, and it was the opinion of one spy, at least, that the Cardinal merely 'amused' England with his overtures, and was prepared, at the earliest opportunity, to restore Charles to his throne, and the young Prince of Orange to his father's office of Stadtholder. He certainly permitted the English privateers to find a refuge in the French ports, where they sold the prizes captured from the Commonwealth with impunity, and he also maintained a fitful negotiation with the Dutch, who were then at war with England.[3]

The Royalists, on the other hand, complained bitterly that 'the juggling Cardinal will not suffer the King of France to do any good for the King; and I may tell you,' added Nicholas, 'I very much apprehend that the design of the Cardinal—and I pray God some in the

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 130, 151. *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 241.

[2] Baillon, *Henriette Marie de France*, p. 561.

[3] *Thurloe State Papers*, ii. pp. 354-5.

Louvre do not concur in it—is to keep the King still a pensioner of France.'[1] 1652

This was in fact Mazarin's intention, and being well aware of Charles's desire to move, he purposely kept him short of money, without which he could not possibly effect his departure. The Stuarts were useful to France not only as a threat to Cromwell, but as a lure whereby the Irish soldiers might be withdrawn from the service of Condé, Lorraine, and Spain.

The banished Irish had in the first instance preferred Spain to France,[2] but they had speedily discovered that her performance accorded ill with her promises, and that her service meant hard fighting, bad quarters, little food and no pay. Ere many months were past, they began to turn longing eyes to France, remembering that she sheltered their Sovereign, and that the Duke of York was actually an officer of her army. Mazarin had anticipated this when he had encouraged James to enter the French service, and the personal reputation won by the young Duke finally decided the action of the wavering Irish. They held, with some justice, that the non-fulfilment of the Spanish promises had absolved them from their own,[3] and in May 1653, Colonel Dillon led the way by deserting Condé with all his troops.[4] In June Colonel Napier followed suit, and placed his regiment at James's disposal. This unexpected proceeding startled not only Spain, but England, and one of Thurloe's spies wrote in much indignation: 'I saw a letter from Madrid which doth testify to the ill-usage that the Irish received there, and those that were once wholly Spanolised are now not at all of that inclination. I believe that their weakness[5] is the cause of it, and the Irish will cause the ruin of Spain. . . . The King of Scots and his devilish ministers,

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 312. [2] See p. 308.

[3] See Articles of Agreement, *Spanish Papers*, Record Office, xliii., 16th February 1652.

[4] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 393.

[5] *i.e.* the distressed condition of Spain.

1653 who have no trade but to practise treason, do invent these foul machinations and practices.'[1]

The exiles were proportionately elated, and when James set out in 1653 to rejoin Turenne in Champagne, he remarked to Charles that 'since he was forced to fight for his bread, he hoped soon to fight to regain his countries.'

The words merely depressed the elder brother, who immediately became 'very melancholy,' but the younger departed in excellent spirits, and in much better equipage than had been his on his first campaign. He possessed now 'four mules to carry his baggage, and a quantity of horses, and indeed great courage, more than those that stayed at home.'[2]

The campaign proved infinitely satisfactory from James's point of view, and the Irish desertions from Spain multiplied rapidly.

'Here are eight regiments at one clap have forsaken the Spaniard, and are now marching to the Duke of York, well-armed, and have under the King of France own hand with the broad seal to have free liberty to serve their own King, in the equipment they came to him, whensoever their own King shall have occasion for them,' wrote an enthusiastic Royalist. 'The King has now 7000 of his own subjects in his service, that are ready, *cap-à-pie* (*sic*), to follow him at an hour's warning.'[3]

Therefore when James returned to Paris in the winter, 'much growne and improved to all purposes, and in extraordinary esteem with the army,' he was warmly welcomed by the French Court, and even Charles became, for a while, a person of some consequence.[4] But, though he was careful to treat James with civility, the Cardinal had no intention of breaking off his English negotiations. Little attention was paid to Charles in his brother's long absences with the army, and the remaining

[1] *Thurloe*, i. p. 323.
[2] *Ibid.* i. p. 319.
[3] *Ibid.* i. p. 526.
[4] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 115.

months of his sojourn in France passed in uncertainty, poverty, and neglect. 1652 February

The doubtful attitude of France made it imperatively necessary to seek friends elsewhere, and hopeless though the quest appeared, Charles did not neglect it. He had long desired to obtain an invitation from the Emperor to visit Vienna, and it was chiefly to prepare the way for this that he accredited Lord Norwich to Brussels and the Hague in February 1652.

The envoy's instructions were copious and detailed. He was first to visit Brussels and obtain from the Archduke Leopold, a gift or loan of money; from the Duke of Lorraine, fresh succours for Ireland. From Brussels he was to proceed to the Hague, where he was to confide to the young Princess of Orange the King's wish to go to Vienna, and to ask her to use her influence on his behalf with the Elector of Brandenburg, and such other Princes as she deemed well disposed towards him. Further, he was to assure her of Charles's sympathy in her quarrels with her mother-in-law, and, at the same time, to beg her to make peace for his sake. If she consented to do so, Norwich was to visit the Princess-Dowager and to mediate between her and her daughter-in-law in Charles's name. He was also to ascertain the real relations of the States-General with the English Commonwealth, and to hint to them that, in the event of war, many Commonwealth ships would come over to the King if the Dutch ports were thrown open to them.

Count Schomberg was then to be sent to Germany, instructed to report on the condition of the various States, the mutual divisions of the Princes, the forces about to be disbanded in the Empire, and the best means of winning their services. He was also to learn the date of the next Diet, and to consult the Elector of Mainz, and the Elector Palatine of the Rhine on the subject of the King's proposed visit to Vienna. And he was to confide to the Palatine—Rupert's brother and

1652 Charles's first cousin—the King's intention of speedily coming to Germany 'with so small a train as shall give no trouble nor umbrage to none.'[1]

As events fell out the mission for which all these instructions had been elaborated proceeded no farther than Brussels. Hyde had, at the outset, expressed the opinion that the chosen envoy, though 'an honest man and a gallant courtier,' would prove 'an admirable ill ambassador,' and his judgment was quickly justified. Norwich, unequal to the 'hard task' of negotiating with 'the most uncertain person in the world,' easily fell a victim to the blandishments of Lorraine. He accepted the Duke's assurances that he had been cruelly misrepresented in the matter of the Irish treaty, and desired nothing more than the restoration of King Charles, for which he would not cease to labour. He rejected the sober counsels of Sir Henry de Vic, who had long been English Resident at Brussels. And, deceived by plausible speeches and lavish promises, he despatched to Paris 'so wild proposals from the Duke of Lorraine' that Charles thought it necessary to send Wilmot to his assistance. Thereupon the Earl, enraged by the arrival of a colleague, resigned his office, and announced his intention of retiring into 'some dark corner,' where he employed himself in writing 'indiscreet and censorious letters,' to the great embarrassment of his friends.[2]

1653 March The collapse of the embassy was of the less consequence so far as Lorraine was concerned, because the subsequent desertion of his Irish soldiers completely destroyed any friendly feeling that he may have cherished for their King. In March 1653 the Irish garrison of one of his castles surrendered to James, and the Duke, in a fury, forbade De Vic his presence. Charles pleaded that he had had no share in the transaction, but Lorraine's

[1] *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., xxix. fol. 40, February 5th-15th, 1652.

[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 57, 58, 67, 73. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 291. *Clanricarde Memoirs*, App. p. 55.

answer was 'not so kind as expected,' and the breach remained unhealed. 1653

'The Duke of Lorraine is grown very unkind to our master upon some passages which happened in the army by the Duke of York, who hath the command of the Irish,' wrote Hyde to Wilmot. '. . . The Duke of Lorraine expresses great dissatisfaction with more passion than you can imagine.'

In July the Duke's 'passion' had risen to such heights that he openly expressed his intention of seizing Charles's person if occasion offered, and actually sent him an insolent message to that effect. Charles retorted by writing down the message and returning it to Lorraine, with a request to be told whether it had really emanated from himself. To this Lorraine returned only a vague reply.[1] July

But the subtle Duke's career of duplicity was drawing to a close. In December 1653 he failed to relieve St. Menehould, for which purpose both Condé and the Archduke had supplied him with money, and a violent quarrel with the French Prince ensued. Even Spain began to weary of her treacherous ally, and in the following March she received definite proofs of his faithlessness. Some of his letters, offering to surrender certain places to France, fell into the Archduke's hands. Lorraine was arrested, and passed the next five years as the prisoner of Spain. This event afforded great satisfaction to the country-people of Flanders, who rejoiced 'as if the devil were chained up from doing further mischiefe.' But Lorraine had been loved by his soldiers, and they, enraged at the loss of their commander, plundered, burned, and ravaged without restraint. The Spanish general sent to take charge of them fled back to Brussels in haste; but subsequently a large number of them consented to serve under Duke Francis, the brother of their lost leader, and the rest passed over to the service of France.[2] December 1654 March

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 192, 199; xlvi. fol. 50, 52, 61.

[2] *Thurloe State Papers*, i. p. 618; ii. pp. 90, 119, 136, 141, 247.

1653 March In the circumstances the fall of Lorraine could be no loss to Charles, but, unfortunately for him, the Duke had not been the only person affected by the Irish desertions. Condé also had lost some of his troops, and if anything were wanting to stimulate his animus towards the English King, it was thus supplied. In March 1653 report said that he had drunk Cromwell's health at Antwerp as 'the wisest, ablest, and greatest commander in Europe,' and Charles was privately warned not to venture within the Prince's power if he valued his personal safety.[1]

Spain had suffered in like manner, both directly and indirectly, through her princely allies. Moreover, Rupert was, at the same time, doing much damage to the Spanish interests in the Azores and on the African coast, for all which reasons it could not be supposed that the Spaniards entertained very friendly feelings for the Stuarts.

1652 These considerations must also, it was supposed, affect the attitude of Austria, whose interest was 'bound up' with that of Spain, and in November 1652 Sir Marmaduke Langdale wrote from Holland: 'If the King expects relief or subsistence from the German Princes he will extremely faile of his expectation.'[2]

August But on the other hand, Austria, having no sea-coast, had very little to fear from England. The Emperor had maintained a consistently friendly attitude towards Charles, and in August 1652 he forbade his ambassador to recognise the Commonwealth agent at Constantinople.[3] This Charles accepted as encouragement, and he resolved to send an ambassador to Ratisbon, where the Imperial Diet was to meet in April 1653 for the election of the King of the Romans.

For this mission Charles selected Wilmot, recently created Earl of Rochester. The choice was not a

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 14. *Thurloe Papers*, ii. p. 187.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 25.
[3] *Ibid.* xliii. fol. 284.

popular one, and Hyde at first opposed it, as he had done earlier the choice of Norwich. But finding that the King's resolution was not to be shaken, the Chancellor dropped his opposition, and thenceforth assisted Wilmot, as he himself said, like a brother. 'And all honest men ought to be of that temper,' he wrote to Nicholas; 'and he who endeavours to cross the service, or to render it unsuccessful, because it is undertaken by such a man whom he loves not, is no less a rebel than Cromwell.'[1]

Wilmot—or rather Rochester, as he was thenceforth called—was instructed to represent the lamentable condition of England, Scotland, and Ireland to the Emperor and Princes assembled at the Diet. He was to point out to the Catholic Princes the King's tolerance of their co-religionists and Cromwell's intolerance; to demonstrate to the Protestants the injury done to religion generally by the 'sectaries,' and to induce all to join in a general manifesto against the King's enemies. Failing this, he was to obtain supplies of money and leave to levy and transport soldiers for the King's service. He was also to ascertain what State, if any, would be willing to receive Charles as a guest. To these instructions were added secret injunctions to assure the Catholic Princes of the King's affection for his Roman Catholic subjects; to promise the Elector of Mainz, personally, that the religious penal laws should be suspended immediately on Charles's restoration, and repealed as soon afterwards as possible; to visit and correspond with the Papal Nuncio, and to treat with him if he proved to be duly authorised from Rome. Money for the embassy was to be asked of Lorraine, with whom Charles had not then quarrelled.[2]

For counsel and advice in all things concerning the Protestant Princes Rochester was to consult with Sir William Curtius, a discreet and learned person, who had long been English Resident at Frankfort. In dealing with the Catholics he was to rely chiefly on John Taylor,

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 118.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 114, 229.

accredited agent to the Electors of Mainz and Cologne, whom Nicholas regarded as a 'factious Papist,' and Hyde as 'an absolute fool.' As secretary, the ambassador was to take with him Richard Bellings, whose 'zeal and experience' would, it was hoped, atone for his want of 'ballast.' This hope was ultimately justified, and the secretary proved 'a great jewel.'[1]

As a preparatory measure letters had been addressed to each Prince of the Empire, to the free cities, and to many generals and Court officials, soliciting their support at the coming Diet. The composition of these letters cost the Chancellor much care and pains.[2] The style and title of each Prince had to be correctly ascertained. The proper style current in each Court had to be 'seasonably and secretly used' in making any reference to the Pope, a course which Hyde justified rather oddly with the remark: 'If the Protestants are skandelized at any formalityes in these addresses, the Catholiques would be no lesse if they had the sight of the reasons and arguments which are applied to the Protestant Princes.'[3] And last, but by no means least, came the question of the degree of intimacy or condescension with which the King should address each Prince. This was an extremely critical matter, since there was found to be 'as much jealousy and animosity amongst the Princes of the Empire as among meaner people.'

Charles had written familiarly to the Elector Palatine:

'My deare Cosen,—I must not content myselfe with writing a formal letter to you, upon whose councill, affection, and interest I so much depend. . . . I am very glad to heare that you have so much power with the Emperor, being confident that you will imploy it for my benefit, and that you will give me councill in all things that concerne me.'

[1] *Nicholas*, i. p. 307. *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 59; xlv. fol. 209. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 96.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv., November-December, 1652.

[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 61.

But this affectionate epistle failed to satisfy Charles Louis of the Rhine when he discovered that his own cousin of Brandenburg had been formally addressed by Charles as 'Frater.' In much indignation he demanded of Rochester the reason for such familiarity. Rochester knew the reason very well, but could not give it, for the title had been bestowed on the Elector of Brandenburg with a view to propitiate his mother-in-law, the Dowager-Princess of Orange. The ambassador's only resource, therefore, was to promise to refer the question to Paris, and this he continued to do until the Palatine wearied of asking it.[1] 1652

But notwithstanding the cordiality of his letter, Charles put little faith in the 'good-nature and gratitude' of his Palatine cousin, who had, during the Civil War, been at some pains to manifest his sympathy with the Parliament.[2] The Princes on whom he built most hope were Frederick William of Brandenburg and John Philip of Mainz. The first of these had frequently expressed 'very great resentment of the King's sad condition and much tenderness towards him.' The other had promised his active support at the Diet, and was generally accounted Charles's 'best friend' among the Princes. Both had personally commended the Stuart cause to the Emperor, and in this the Elector of Bavaria followed their example.[3] Some encouragement was also derived from the kindness with which an impostor, posing as James, Duke of York, had been received in various places in Austria.

'The Duke of York is wonderfully delighted with the civility and respects which have been paid to his counterfeit in those parts, and it is a strong instance of hope of affection in that people,' averred Hyde.[4]

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 205. *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 203; xlv. fol. 132.

[2] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 257. *Rupert, Prince Palatine*, p. 89.

[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 103. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 309.

[4] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 169.

1652 December

It was with good hope that Rochester set out from Paris on Thursday the 27th of December 1652. He had been properly accredited as ambassador, and was at liberty to use that title if he chose, but it was considered more prudent that he should avoid this, 'and do his business in a private way,' partly from motives of economy, and partly because that course was likely 'to procure a speedier despatch.' He therefore travelled incognito, accompanied only by five or six servants and his secretary, Richard Bellings.[1]

1653 March

Rochester had hardly arrived at his journey's end when sinister rumours of his conduct were forwarded to Paris, and it seemed that he was about to justify Hyde's disapproval of his appointment even more disastrously than Norwich had done. 'I must needs lament my Lord Rochester's carriage at Ratisbon,' wrote a correspondent to Nicholas. 'There they say he is frequently drunk in public, and in his drink talks at random against the House of Austria, and the evil offices the late King received from it. And, in particular, of late at the Duke of Wurtemburg's table, where there were present divers gentlemen of the Chamber to the Emperor, who acquainted his Imperial Majesty the same night with what passed, but he seemed to take no notice of it. I cannot think it should be in his instructions to carry himself so. Mr. Taylor, being present, did what he could to divert the discourse, but the other took his advertisement so ill that they were like to have fallen by the ears yesterday.'

Rochester's well-known character and habits made this very circumstantial story only too credible, but inquiry happily proved it to be merely the machination of his enemies. He had, in fact, never dined with the Duke of Wurtemburg at all, and the uniform kindness and civility which he received from the Emperor and Princes sufficiently gave the lie to these reports of his indiscretion. Better founded were Nicholas's complaints of the ambassador's carelessness, for he neither answered

[1] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 266. *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 59; xlv. fol. 170, 209.

any questions nor acknowledged any letters. Indeed he denied having received any from Nicholas, until that worthy secretary was reduced to inquire of Hyde: 'Are you sure that he does not, when he receives any letters, put them in his pocket and forget that he received them?'[1] 1653

Hyde was by no means sure that this was not the case, but in other respects Rochester behaved fairly well, and he certainly had no cause to complain of his reception. The College of Electors at once expressed 'a great compassion with his Majesty's ill-fortune and a readiness to assist him,' but referred all details to the Diet, notwithstanding the Elector Palatine's picturesque plea that they would 'hasten the assistance, lest the sick come to dye before the medicine be ready.'[2]

The Diet met in April 1653. May found Rochester and Taylor 'poor but busy,' and it was confidently asserted that the Princes would not only make a collection of money for Charles, but would make peace between France and Spain, obstruct the treaty between England and Holland, and unite all the powers against the Commonwealth.[3] May

The first business of the Diet was, however, the election of the King of the Romans. The choice was a foregone conclusion, and on the 18th of June the Emperor's eldest son was duly elected and crowned. On the following day the Princes were entertained by the Spanish ambassador at a banquet which lasted from noon to ten o'clock at night. Fountains of wine ran in the streets, money was thrown lavishly from the windows, and it was remarked that the green liveries of the lacqueys and pages were obscured by the masses of silver lace that covered them. June

When these festivities were ended came Rochester's

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. pp. 6, 11. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fol. 211, 5th September and 10th October 1653.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 376.

[3] *Thurloe Papers*, i. p. 237.

1653 opportunity, and a spy who dined with him in June found him in high spirits, having had, as he said, *bona verba*. Charles's promises of toleration for the Roman Church had gained the better hearing for Cromwell's persecution in Ireland, and Rochester would have carried all before him but for the opposition of Spain.

He had, however, a secret enemy in the Spanish ambassador, who vehemently supported the claims of his rival, the Polish ambassador. The Pole had no personal enmity to Rochester, but he, like the Englishman, was soliciting the Imperial aid for his master, and as it was not to be supposed that both could be satisfied, they were perforce rivals. Rochester ultimately gained the day, despite the efforts of the Spaniard, and the Polish envoy departed disappointed, while the Englishman was invited to remain in the expectation of receiving at least money and jewels. He was held in such 'great esteem' that rumour anticipated the arrival of Charles in person, who would, it was said, 'be highly received.'[1] Rochester had indeed been charged to consult the Princes as to whither the King should go, and to endeavour to obtain an invitation from one of them, but this he could not accomplish. The Thirty Years' War had reduced the Princes to the depths of poverty; many declared themselves bankrupt; all had been put to great expense by the election of the King of the Romans, and none were in a case to embarrass themselves with an expensive and troublesome guest.'[2]

Still less were they able to undertake the burden of a
July war on Charles's behalf, and by the end of July the Diet had decided that it could not publicly embrace Charles's cause. As some consolation the Emperor promised Rochester a donation of 100,000 rix-dollars for his master, and bade him apply to each Prince separately for further aid. This he did, with the result that, thanks mainly to the influence of the Elector of Mainz, the Diet voted

[1] *Thurloe*, i. p. 297.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fols. 36-8.

Charles a four months' subsidy with only one dissentient voice. The time of payment and the amount to be contributed was left to each Prince to decide for himself according to his own capacity. The sums promised, therefore, varied from 240 rix-dollars to 20 rix-dollars per month, and the total did not exceed 1764 rix-dollars.[1] More unfortunately still, only a very small part of that sum ever reached Charles at all. By June 1654 the Emperor had paid only a fraction of what he undertook, and the Princes were even slower. The Elector of Mainz, indeed, paid in full, and by his persuasion induced one or two others to do the same, but the money came in slowly, far short of the sums anticipated, and several princes, among whom were the Elector Palatine and the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, eventually paid nothing at all. 1653

Of the ten thousand pounds that was actually raised much was wasted by Rochester in fruitless negotiations and useless journeys. He had now become 'extremely possessed with the spirit of being the King's general,' and he lingered long in Germany, negotiating with unemployed officers, and levying men for the King's service. The fact that there were neither ports nor ships available for their transport to England, Ireland, or Scotland troubled him not at all. Probably he preferred to remain in a country where he received only kindness and respect to rejoining his starving and bickering compatriots at Paris. He appears at least to have fared well during his absence. In October 1653 Richard Bellings expressed a wish that he could share with 'the honest lads' at Paris 'this or that lovely joint of meat, which my Lord's table hath never wanted twice a day, most think by enchantment, for none can find the natural cause of good meat without money.'[2] October

And a few months later he wrote jubilantly to Hyde's secretary: 'You will hardly believe me, but I assure you

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fols. 52, 118, 141, 143. *Thurloe*, i. p. 581.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fol. 285.

1653 December

it is true, we have had this Christmasse plumm porige, mince-pies, bake meats, brawne, and have sometimes been merry and laught—though at ourselves.'[1]

Charles had hoped that the Embassy to Ratisbon would open the way to a new negotiation at Rome, and he had directed Rochester to obtain the Emperor's intercession with the Pope. In this the ambassador had succeeded, and the Emperor had written to recommend Charles's cause to Innocent X. In the meantime Charles had been informed by the French Vicar-General of the Augustines that his previous messages to Rome had been received 'with good liking,' and he thereupon wrote to the Pope himself, renewing his protestations of good-will for his Roman Catholic subjects and offering to send 'a person of confidence' to treat at Rome. The Papal reply was, however, less cordial than had been hoped. The Pontiff expressed an earnest wish for the King's welfare, but added that he must prefer religion to any other consideration, and could not, therefore, receive any agent from Charles until he had given '*quelque espérance résonable*' of his conversion to the Roman faith.[2]

April

Yet notwithstanding this it was proposed in April 1653 to send Lord Taafe and Dr. Callaghan on a mission to Rome. The chief object of this mission was to satisfy the Irish, who demanded that some person should be sent to give the Pope a true and faithful account of Irish affairs, but the project met with opposition on all sides.[3] The Protestants declared loudly that Taafe was empowered to offer both the King's conversion and the establishment of the Roman Church in Ireland in return for the Papal aid in the recovery of that country. The Queen was furious because her confessor, Walter Montagu, had not been chosen as the envoy; and the

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 244.

[2] *Ibid.* xlv. fol. 36, 44; xlvi. fol. 61. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 181.

[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, xlv. fols. 209, 217.

religious orders, but especially the Jesuits, objected fiercely to the selection of Callaghan, whom they condemned as a Jansenist. Thus assailed on all sides, Charles was fain to recede from his intention, and on April the 25th Hyde wrote to Rochester: 1653

'The discourses and calumnys raysed and scattered abroad by persons of all religions hath made the King conclude yt such an address, at this time, is not seasonable, and soe it is layed aside.'[1]

The projected mission to Rome was probably the more readily abandoned because the Royalist hopes were still centred upon an alliance with the Protestant Dutch, then at war with England.

Though the Republicans had ruled in the States-General ever since the death of William II., their desire for a close alliance with England had met with constant opposition from the Orange party, and this opposition was strengthened by the unreasonable attitude of England herself. Not content with an ordinary alliance, she had proposed 'a perpetual confederation' with the States, under such stringent conditions as would practically weld the two republics into one. This proposal was, very naturally, rejected by the States-General, and in July 1651, the English envoys, St. John and Strickland, had returned home burning with wrath against the Dutch. In October the English Parliament revenged the rejection of its overtures by passing the Navigation Act. This Act prohibited the importation of foreign goods to England in any but English vessels, or in those of the country producing the goods, and thus struck a fatal blow at the carrying trade of Holland and Zealand. These two provinces, having no native produce of their own, had become the carriers of the world, and to deprive them of this trade was to ruin them. Other grievances helped to fan the flame of war. Dutch vessels had been seized by English privateers on the plea that they carried French goods; and the English claim to the 1651 July October

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 7. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fols. 330, 331.

1652 sovereignty of the seas was a constant source of irritation to her neighbours, yet the States were not eager for war. They knew that the English navy was in good repair, while their own had fallen into a miserable condition since the death of the Stadtholder, and they therefore attempted remonstrance. But their complaints were met by a counter claim for injuries done to England fifty years before, and in view of this unconciliatory attitude war became inevitable.

April On 6th April 1652 the Dutch admiral, Van Tromp, put to sea with very vague instructions. On May 12th he fell foul of Blake off Fairlight, shots were fired, the Dutch lost two vessels, and the war was begun.

This was Charles's long-desired opportunity. The most obvious way for the Dutch to injure England was to embrace his cause, and he might at least hope that they would open their ports to his ships, which were in dire need of such shelter. Moreover he was not without friends among the Dutch themselves. Count William Frederick of Nassau had always expressed a kindly desire to serve him, and many members of the Orange party were eager for his alliance. Of the number of these was Mynheer Borell, or Boreel, the States' ambassador at Paris, who had been formerly ambassador at the Court of Charles I. For the sake of old days he had always shown himself 'very civil' to the exiles, and he at once informed Charles of the outbreak of hostilities between the Dutch and English. The King, greatly exhilarated, hastened to thank him for the welcome news, and offered to ask French aid for the Dutch, to employ his own ships in their service, and to send an ambassador to the Hague.[1]

William II. would doubtless have embraced the overture, but the oligarchy in power distrusted Charles, as the uncle of their rejected Stadtholder. Moreover the war, though begun, was not declared, and they shrank from rendering England irreconcilable to themselves.

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliii. fol. 121.

While they hesitated the negotiations between Charles and Borell suffered interruption by the flight of the English Court from St. Germains. Sir Richard Browne, the English Resident at Paris, was, however, directed to confer constantly with the Dutch ambassador, and the King himself sent twice a week for letters to Paris, though the difficulty of paying his messengers, and the dangers encountered by them proved a serious hindrance to his affairs.[1] 1652 June

In the same month occurred the formal declaration of war, and the King, being duly informed of it, wrote to Borell that, 'low as his power was,' he could, 'put such places in Ireland and Scotland into the hands of Holland as would enable them (*sic*) to torment their enemies.' He also sent a message to the Hague to the effect that, with the Dutch alliance, he could regain Scilly and the Channel Islands, and would, in return, place the Orkneys in the hands of his allies, thus securing to them their fishing rights for ever.[2] A week later he invited them to cut off the Commonwealth's coal supply by seizing Newcastle and Tynemouth in his name, and he also endeavoured to demonstrate the ease with which the ships of the Parliament might be drawn over to his own service. But none of these projects availed to move the States-General, and it was in vain that Hyde urged Nicholas to procure an invitation to the Hague for the King.[3] July

At this juncture — September 1652 — Blake unexpectedly attacked the French fleet as it went to relieve Dunkirk. This produced a change in the attitude of France, and Mazarin, thrown back for the moment on the Royalist interest, promised to use his influence with the Dutch in Charles's behalf. He also proposed an alliance between France and the United Provinces, September

[1] *Evelyn*, iv. pp. 249, 260.

[2] *Ibid.* iv. p. 256. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 85.

[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 90, 100. *Clarendon MSS.*, 13th September 1652. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 311.

1652 which he requested Charles to negotiate, advising him to go to the Hague for the purpose. Charles undertook the commission gladly, but judged it best to consult with Borell, who as readily embraced the overture. Nicholas was thereupon directed to open negotiations with the States-General, and, at the Queen's desire, Culpepper was appointed as his colleague. For this, which, he said, he 'could not handsomely avoid,' Charles apologised to Nicholas, but his orders to treat both Percy and Culpepper 'with civility and freedom-like trust,' while concealing from them all that was of real importance, did not tend to simplify the worthy secretary's task.

October Borell had declared that if France were sincere the States would most readily accept her alliance; but France was not wholly sincere in her offers, and the factious condition of the States themselves helped to stultify the negotiation.

'The factious party among the States, for jealousy of Orange, do endeavour to oppose all that relates to his Majesty's advantage,' said Nicholas.[1]

Charles next offered, as a bribe, the island of Guernsey, which, he said, he could easily recover from the Parliament, but even this was without effect, and the suspension of the Orangist admiral, Van Tromp, for which his defeat in July afforded an excuse, augured ill for the King's hopes.

November But the republican admiral, De Witt, had no better fortune than his rival, and his ill success resulted in an Orangist reaction. In November, Van Tromp, restored to his command, won a victory off Dungeness, and only forbore to enter the Thames for want of a pilot. The Orange party was for the moment triumphant, six of the Provinces declared for the English King, and the Dutch ports were opened to the Royalist vessels.

Charles wrote a grateful acknowledgment to the States-

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 104, 177. *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 307, 313.

General, promising to 'send advertisement to his cosen Prince Rupert, to the end that he may repair thither with his Majesty's fleet under his command, and to his other ships which are at sea.' He added that his prizes would be presumably protected, and that a place should be assigned for the keeping of his prisoners. He also suggested that an encouraging declaration of the States would bring over many English sailors to Holland.[1] 1652

It was, however, significant that the States, while making the long-sought concession of the ports, omitted Charles's title from the official order, 'merely out of fear to disgust or exasperate the English rebels.'[2] This caution was due to the influence of Holland, which hoped still for peace with England, but Charles's Presbyterian subjects saw in it distrust of his religious sentiments. They informed him that his conduct since his return from Scotland had alienated the ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church, who had formerly displayed 'great zeale in their affections' towards him, and had thereby 'much raysed the spirits of the people'; and they urged him to conciliate them by a diligent attendance at the Huguenot Church at Charenton.

'That councell that perverts your Majesty from giving ye Reformed Church at Charenton your presence sometymes was very unwholesome councell, and tended much to your Majesty's prejudice. Nor can I think but yet your Majesty showing yourself in their congregation would beget much zeale in the ministry to your Majesty's service,' declared Colonel Edward Massey.

And Alderman Bunce wrote to the same effect: 'It would certainly advance your Majesty in their opinions if your Majesty would more countenance the reformed churches of France by your Majesty's presence in their congregations.'[3]

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv., 29th November 1652. *Holland Papers*, Record Office, clix., 7th December 1652.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 4.

[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fols. 27, 265.

1653 February

But Charles's decision on that point had been already made in the negative, and not even to gain the Dutch ministers would he recede from it. His hopes were still high, and after Van Tromp's defeat off Portland in February 1653, he took a bolder step than he had yet done. Having assured Borell that he was 'very heartily sorry' for the English victory, he added:

'If the States will assign me some ships—no more than they think may fitly serve under my standard—I will engage my own person with them in the company of their fleet, and either by God's blessing prevail with them or perish in the attempt.'[1]

Borell replied with demurs, expressing his 'tenderness' for the King's personal safety, and entreating him to reconsider so momentous a proposal. But Charles, in great impatience, bade Hyde write at once to Borell and insist on the forwarding of his letter to the Hague by the first post. Hyde, who, like the ambassador, doubted the wisdom of such a step, delayed in his turn until Charles, finding the letter still unwritten, sat down in the Chancellor's room and refused to stir until it had been indicted and despatched in his presence.[2]

June

He did but court another disappointment, for this offer, like all his previous offers, was rejected. He received, however, a private message of sympathy from Zealand, and many of the other States deprecated the too great caution of Holland. Another English victory in June 1653 added poignancy to their regrets, and a Dutchman wrote from London:

'I am told privately by discreet, wise, and understanding men and persons of honour that, in case the King of Scots had been in the fight the last time, many of the Parliament ships would have turned to him; and they told it me so earnestly and positively that I do verily believe it true.'

At the same time, Count William Frederick of Nassau

[1] *Holland Papers*, clix., 6th March 1653. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 48.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 125.

urged Charles to collect his ships and display his standard, 1653
while Borell suggested that Rupert's presence at the Hague would draw many privateers thither. But it was not considered safe for the Prince to go to Holland uninvited, and though Sir Marmaduke Langdale endeavoured to get ships in Zealand, the attempt failed for want of money.[1]

Despairing of the Dutch since their rejection of his April
last offer, Charles turned next to their ally, Frederick III. of Denmark, to whom he despatched Lord Wentworth as ambassador in April 1653. Wentworth's instructions were to ask Frederick's intercession for Charles with the States-General; to obtain the freedom of the Danish ports for the Royalist vessels, and, at the least, to get arms and ammunition for Scotland, with the loan of a few ships. That accomplished, he was to proceed on a similar errand to the Dukes of Holstein and Oldenburg.

It was Hyde's opinion that the mission could do no harm, but little good. Nicholas judged Wentworth 'a very intelligent person,' but augured ill for his success, seeing plainly that Denmark would be wholly guided by Holland—as the event proved.[2] At the first, however, Frederick received Wentworth cordially, expressed much sympathy for his distressed relative King Charles, promised succours for Scotland, and made the desired appeal to the States-General. The Dutch remained unmoved, but Charles was so far encouraged that, in June 1653, he sought the command of the fleet with which Denmark had undertaken to defend the Baltic against England, promising 'to embark himself in person' as soon as was possible. But this was a step beyond what Frederick could venture, and he replied with admirable frankness that his cousinly affection for Charles would not lead him to endanger his own interests, since

[1] *Thurloe*, i. p. 331. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 164, 167. *Nicholas Papers*, i., 22nd September 1652; ii. 13.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fols. 217, 233. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 7.

1653 April 'each must consider his own welfare in these troubled times.'[1]

The Dutch, in the meanwhile, were craving for peace. The war had been disastrous for them throughout, the country was suffering severely, and the starving population, mindful of former prosperous days, clamoured for their Stadtholder. Peasants and soldiers adorned themselves with orange ribbons, riots were of constant occurrence, the Orange party began to 'carry it very high,' and the Republicans' only hope lay in the restoration of peace and plenty. For this reason they had made overtures to England as early as April 1653, but the English terms were too hard for acceptance, and the negotiation dropped until June, when another severe defeat induced the States to reopen it.

June The English, still insisting on a complete amalgamation of the two Republics, offered to join with the Dutch 'as one man against all the ungodly in the world.' But 'those drunk, pickled stuff,' the Dutch, objected to the sacrifice of their national independence; the treaty failed, and Cromwell parted from the Dutch envoy, Nieuport, in tears.[2]

July The immediate result of this failure was a demonstration in favour of the Prince of Orange, known as 'the Children's Riot,' because it was chiefly promoted by young boys. The houses of the Republicans were violently attacked. The Grand Pensionary De Witt, the principal object of the rioters' hatred, was branded as 'Prince Betrayer,' his windows were broken, and he, 'with much ado, saved himself at a back door, running into a neighbour's house without hat or cloak, and thence to the Court for safety.'[3]

This was the condition of affairs when, in the last days of July, Monk inflicted a final and fatal defeat on Van

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 19; xlvi. fol. 87. *Clarenaon State Papers*, iii. p. 173.

[2] *Thurloe State Papers*, i. pp. 295, 329, 386.

[3] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 18. *Thurloe*, i. pp. 383, 391.

Tromp off the Texel. The Dutch admiral was killed, the Dutch fleet destroyed, and the ruin of the States seemed complete. 1653 July-November

Holland, led by De Witt, advocated peace at any price, but the other provinces violently repudiated the suggestion. The young Prince of Orange was elected Stadtholder of Zealand and the northern provinces, and the States of Guelderland passed resolutions to restore the house of Orange, to prosecute the war with vigour, to embrace Charles's interest, aiding the Scots and Irish with money, and to make a league offensive and defensive with France.

The States of Holland retorted by voting to defer the election of the Stadtholder, requesting the Princess Mary not to receive her brother at Breda, and resolving to admit no foreign prince to their territory without express permission from themselves. The Emperor thereupon urged the Protestant Princes to exert their influence with Holland to obstruct the peace; Mazarin threw all his weight into the same scale, and Frederick of Denmark offered succours to the States on condition that they espoused Charles's cause. The position of the war party was further strengthened by a Royalist rising in the Scottish Highlands. Exaggerated rumours of its success made the Orangists 'more bould' and 'refreshed the drooping spirits of the Cavaliers.'

'They make it all their discourse to the Dutch,' wrote a spy to Thurloe, 'and persuade them by no means to make a peace . . . to which, I observe, many of the Dutch do listen, but the wiser and better sort of men do regard it as an old, cavalier, phantastick story.'[1]

The story, however 'phantastick,' worked so much upon the States-General that they actually despatched some arms to Scotland, and a rumour became current at Bruges that they had offered the English King the

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fol. 87. *Thurloe State Papers*, i. pp, 449, 463, 487, 488, 493, 510, 514, 565.

1653 loan of eighty ships of war.[1] The rumour was, of course, unfounded, for, with the best will in the world, the Dutch were in no case to lend ships to any one, but their reviving friendliness stimulated Charles to fresh
September efforts. In September he wrote to Nicholas lamenting the 'factions and jealousies' which divided his well-wishers at the Hague, and bidding him assure the Government 'that it is in my power to add more strength to those States than is imaginable.' In
December December he wrote urgently to his sister, begging her to make at least a semblance of reconciliation with the Princess-Dowager and Count William Frederick.

'If there cannot be an intire reconciliation of trust and confidence between you and the Dowager and Count William, let no man be able justly to say that it is declined on your part,' he entreated, 'but show at least an inclination to it, and preserve civilities to them, that I may performe all ceremonies to them that are necessary to my condition; they making every day great professions of a particular respect and passion for me, and I have received, this last week, as kind words from Count William, and as large expressions of affection as you can imagine.'

The Princess Mary, albeit a devoted sister, was unskilled in the art of dissembling, and though she had promised to be 'civil' to Count William, she found the effort most uncongenial and wellnigh impossible to her.[2] Her failure to comply with a previous request of her brother had already cost him the friendship of Borell. The ambassador had wished to secure for his son the office of Hofmeister to the young Prince of
1652 November Orange, and in November 1652 Charles had written to his sister, reminding her that the younger Borell had enjoyed the favour of her late husband, and begging her to give him the place desired.

[1] *Thurloe*, i. p. 463. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., xlii. fol. 41.
[2] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 202. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 177. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 108.

'I need not tell you how much you and I are beholdinge to M. Boreel,' he declared. 'Indeed, he is very kind to us both, and very solicitous to advance our interests which we must requyte when we are able. It is your good fortune to have it in your power presently to oblige him, which he must expect longer from mee. I finde that his eldest sonne, who wayted on my dear brother, the Prince of Orange, and is so well knowne to you, may, by your favour, be made Hofmeister to my nephew, and if you will confer on him some office of trust and honour over the lands that are in your joynture, the ambassador will take himself to be much obliged to you. I pray you therefore gratify him in these particulars, and I promise you when it shall be in my power to express it, he and his shall finde how sensible I am of his great meritt towards my father and myselfe, and also of his respect to you.' 1652

But Mary, much harassed by her own affairs, and already too much importuned on behalf of her brother's friends, ignored the letter, and a few weeks later Charles wrote again:

'Though you take no notice of what I wrote a month since on behalfe of young M. Boreel, yet I hope you have let him know my kindnesse towards him, and said somewhat to him of your good opinion and purpose to oblige him.'

This second exhortation had no more effect than the first, and in April 1653 Charles remonstrated strongly, urging his sister to say, at the least, some words of kindness and gratitude to Borell's son. 'Such casual expressions many times doing much good, and never any hurt.'[1] 1653 April

Unfortunately the Princess was not, like her brother, proficient in the art of making gracious speeches, and the Borells looked for deeds, not words. Consequently when Lord Percy arrived in Paris, bearing a letter from Mary to the effect that the place in question had long been promised to himself, the ambassador was so deeply offended that he 'declined all the old freedome, and

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 15; xlv. fol. 294.

1654 January declared, playnely enough, that he would be no more concerned for the King's service.' This state of mind endured for more than a month, and when he 'returned to his old kindness' in January 1654, his friendship had become a matter of comparative indifference.[1]

April The war was practically over. England, in great straits of poverty and unable longer to man her navy, was at last ready to offer reasonable terms to her enemies; Holland was resolved on peace, and the other States had but small choice in the matter. After a long and tedious negotiation a treaty was signed on the 5th-15th of April 1654. By its terms both States bound themselves to expel the enemies of the other from their territories, never 'to grant them any lodging, help, or entertainment,' and to lend active aid against them if it should be required. This clause was, of course, aimed at the Stuarts, but lest they should yet be sheltered by the House of Orange, a further clause provided 'that no rebell or declared enemy of the republique of England shall be admitted or suffered to abide in any castles, towns, havens, or other privileged or unprivileged places apertaining to any persons, of what dignity or State they may be, within the dominion or jurisdiction of the United Provinces.'[2] Thus, it was made impossible for Mary to receive her brother even in her son's own town of Breda.

Further, Cromwell demanded the permanent exclusion of the Prince of Orange from the office of Stadtholder. To get this clause accepted by the States-General was manifestly impossible, but by a secret arrangement between Cromwell and De Witt, the Provincial States of Holland were induced to pass a resolution rendering the Prince and his descendants for ever incapable of holding office in the State. When this resolution was made public some weeks later it excited bitter indignation, and the States of Zealand, Groningen, and Utrecht at once declared it 'null and void' as 'contrary to fundamental law.' But the other provinces, though they

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 93, 228. [2] *Ibid.* xlviii. fol. 191.

'talked high,' were powerless to restore the Stadtholder without the concurrence of Holland, and they eventually submitted to the inevitable 'with as much patience as ever you saw any beasts.' The peace, proclaimed on the 27th of May 1654, was received with resignation but without enthusiasm; the rejoicings were few and faint, Leyden made no sign, and Dort openly displayed the Orange colours, nor did De Witt dare to order their removal.[1] 1654 May

To the Royalists the news of the treaty came as a fatal blow. 'It has struck us dead!' wrote Hyde,[2] and with good reason, for all the hopes built upon the Dutch hostility to England were thus dashed to the ground, and the year 1654 saw the English Protectorate recognised by one European power after another.

Denmark, following the lead of the States, was included in the peace of April 1654. In the same month Sweden also signed a commercial treaty with England, and this was the more humiliating because it had long been a cherished scheme of the Royalists to marry their King to Queen Christina. She had, indeed, never given Charles any active assistance, but she had constantly expressed goodwill towards him, and had passively suffered his agents to levy troops on her soil and to sail from her ports. On the other hand she had always refused to receive a formal embassy from him, but in May 1653 he had ventured to send Sir William Bellenden to Sweden, charging him to discuss the Royalist affairs with the Queen, and to induce her to join with Denmark and the United Provinces against England. Bellenden was also intrusted with letters from Charles to Christina, but these he was instructed to withhold if he was not cordially received. April 1653 May

The caution was justified, for the Swedish interests made an English alliance necessary, and in January 1654 Charles received a brief missive from the Queen, 1654 January

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 365; xlviii. fol. 190, 200.

[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 314.

1654 which informed him that his agent had discharged his mission to her faithfully, and that she deeply regretted her inability to comply with his wishes without injuring her own country. The Royalists attributed her conduct to the fact that she had already appointed her cousin, Charles Gustavus of Zwei-brücken, her heir. 'Because, having named a successor, she despairs of ever having the King for a husband.' But Christina had no desire
June to marry Charles, or any one else. On the 6th of June 1654 she abdicated the throne in favour of her cousin, and was received into the Roman Church.[1]

Portugal had long since made her peace with England,
July and in July 1654 she also concluded a commercial treaty with the Protectorate. But, most bitter of all, was the defection of France. Mazarin, disappointed of his league with Holland, turned back to England, recognised the Protector, accorded to Bordeaux the status of ambassador, and offered to banish Charles from France in return for an English alliance. Cromwell, still hesitating between France and Spain, vacillated during months of rather discreditable haggling, literally offering his alliance for sale to the highest bidder, and alternately proposing
September to join each country against the other. In September 1654 France wearied of the bargain, and finding that the Protector could not yet resolve to break with Spain, contented herself with a treaty of peace and commerce.[2] There could be little doubt that an alliance would eventually follow, and in any case the shelter that had so long been his was lost to the exiled King. He found himself in the summer of 1654 without a single ally among the powers, without a Court willing to receive him as a guest, and with no other hope or consolation than such as he might derive from the vague expressions of sympathy accorded to him by the Emperor and the German Princes.

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 308. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 115.

[2] Chéruel, *France sous Mazarin*, ii. pp. 349-93. Gardiner, *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, ii. pp. 444, 469, 476. *Thurloe*, ii. pp. 309, 351, 352.

CHAPTER XVI

The Union of England and Scotland—Discontent of the Scots—Dunnottar Castle—Middleton's Escape to France—The Scots Message to the King—The Highland Association—Middleton goes to Holland for Supplies—The Princess of Orange—Activity of the Highlanders—Colonel Bampfylde turns Traitor—Is sent to the King with Messages—Lorne joins the Royalists—Glencairn takes Command—Adventure of Colonel Wogan—The Royalists at Ruthven—Secession of Lorne—Secession of Balcarres—Moray accused of Treason—Arrival of Middleton—Secession of Glencairn—The King's Presence desired—Defeat of the Royalists—The Chiefs make Terms—Middleton and Napier escape.

THE bitterness of Charles's friendless condition was accentuated by the knowledge that without some succour from the Continent all the efforts made by his friends at home must prove abortive. In particular he had relied upon Denmark and Holland to support the new rising in the Scottish Highlands, and for the lack of their support that rising was now doomed to failure.

The conquest of Scotland had seemed at first complete. The English Commissioners, sent to Dalkeith in January 1652, had obtained a tacit consent to the Union of Scotland with England, and on the 21st of April the formal declaration of the Union was read at Edinburgh. But the Scottish assent thereto was merely nominal. If the power of resistance was paralysed the national spirit remained implacably hostile to the conquerors, and England endeavoured to conciliate it in vain.

1652 January April

Monk was not the man to trust to mere conciliation, and he continued his work of conquest with steady determination. New forts were erected in disaffected

1652 districts, old strongholds were destroyed, and by the end of April 1652 only Dunnottar Castle held out for the King.

This castle, which was besieged by Colonel Morgan and defended by George Ogilvy, overhung the sea, so that a vessel of considerable size might ride beneath its walls. It was large enough to shelter a whole army, and it contained—besides Charles's own hangings, bedding, plate, and furniture, valued at £20,000—the regalia of Scotland—namely, the sword, crown, and sceptre, presented to James IV. by Pope Julius.

No wonder, then, that the King considered the castle 'the foundation of all hope,' and strained every nerve to save it. Ogilvy had sent word that his courage was good, but that his supplies were short; and Charles, exhorting him to hold out, entreated Webster, a merchant of Amsterdam, to victual the castle at three months' credit. At the same time he besought his sister to lend a ship to convey the supplies to Dunnottar, stipulating that the whole transaction must be kept from the Queen's Court, which was 'not very famous for secrecy.'

May But the relief was too long delayed, and Ogilvy was forced to capitulate on the 26th of May. The regalia was, however, saved by the wit of his wife, who had it carried out in a sack of flax and buried beneath the floor of Kineff Church.[1]

The last stronghold had fallen, but Royalism still flickered in the Highlands. Though Argyle had accepted the incorporation with England, neither his son nor his clansmen could endure the English garrisons in their midst, and they were ready to join in any fresh movement for the King. Such a movement was already in prospect.

March Early in 1652 Lieutenant-General Middleton, who had been taken prisoner at Worcester, made his escape from the Tower, and in March he arrived at Paris, accompanied by a Scottish minister, Henry Knox. This minister was

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 55, 60-2, 72, 74, 79. *Gardiner*, ii. p. 71.

the agent of Lord Balcarres, and had been sent to the Scottish prisoners in London by those of the King's friends who had sought refuge in the Highlands. Finding Middleton at large, he obtained credentials from the prisoners and came over with the fugitive to lay the Scottish proposals before the King himself. After describing 'the terror that was struck into the hearts of that whole nation by the severe proceedings of George Munke,' and complaining bitterly of Argyle, 'who prosecuted all the King's friends with the utmost malice,' he assured the King, on behalf of the lords in the Highlands, that they 'would never swerve from their duty,' and that they would well be able to hold their own and to harass the enemy throughout the winter. In the spring they expected to have an army able to meet Monk, if Middleton, their best general, were sent over to them with arms and ammunition. 1652

One condition they attached to their promises. The Queen who had, they feared, 'too good an opinion of Argyle,' was to be told nothing of their plans, and Buckingham, Jermyn, and Wilmot were to be kept in equal ignorance. The only persons trusted in the affair were to be Ormonde, Newburgh, and Hyde, and all the despatches were to be made by the Chancellor personally. Charles conceded the conditions readily, but Hyde demurred. He had always cherished a deep distrust of the Scots, and knew that many of them reciprocated his feelings. He was, besides, well aware that 'this trust would deprive him of all hope of the Queen's favour,' since Henrietta would never pardon the implied slight to herself. But Charles would take no refusal. He promised to explain to his mother that the Scots had chosen their own confidants, for which she could not reasonably blame Hyde; and whatever came of it, the Chancellor must, he said, undertake the business, or see it totally abandoned. Hyde thereupon yielded to the King's commands and dealt with the intrigue for many years; but all his patient care and toil produced little

1652-1653 result beyond 'those inconveniences which he had foreseen.'[1]

Throughout the winter the Highlanders harassed the English as they had promised, making plundering raids on the Lowlands, and nightly attacks on the enemy's garrisons. No army was gathered in the spring, but the summer brought Charles renewed assurances of loyalty from an association of Highland chiefs and Lowland lairds, of which Angus Macdonald of Glengarry was the moving spirit. Each of the associated chiefs bound himself to raise a force for the King, varying in numbers from 1000 to 400 men, and they asked, in return, for the royal commission, arms, ammunition—and Middleton. Charles at once sent them the only thing in his power—the commission, authorising Glengarry, Ewan Cameron of Lochiel, and four others to elect a general to act until Middleton's arrival.[2] He had already appointed Middleton commander-in-chief for Scotland, and despatched him to raise money and collect the necessary supplies in Holland.

1652 August The Scottish general had a hard task before him. The States, notwithstanding their war with England, were chary of lending him aid or countenance, and poverty and illness further hampered his proceedings. Charles, who took the enterprise very seriously, would fain have relieved his agent had it been possible, and in November November 1652 he wrote to condole with him.

'And when you know, which you would not thinke, that I have scarce received two hundred pistoles since you went from me, you will not believe that it is my fault that you have not been relieved,' he protested. '. . . For God's sake, thinke of what is more to bee done, for my harte is more set upon that worke than you imagine.'[3]

1653 April Middleton needed no urging. By April 1653 he had obtained from Count Waldeck a promise to raise 1500 men for Charles, on a pretence of levying for the King

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. pp. 138-41.
[2] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 314. *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 221.
[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 32.

of Denmark; and Frederick of Denmark himself promised ships and arms, the details of which Wentworth was left to arrange. Six of the United Provinces had expressed their willingness to aid the English King, but Holland, the most important, still hung back, and in July 1653 Glencairn wrote from the Highlands suggesting that fishing-ports in Scotland should be offered to the Dutch in return for their assistance.[1] Middleton thereupon presented a memorial to the States-General, setting forth the extreme embarrassment of England and the Scots' readiness to fight for the King, to which he added details of the supplies that were so urgently needed. In return for these, he assured the States of the King's permission to build forts on the West Coast of Scotland, and in the Isles, for the protection of their fishing-fleets. This, combined with a report that ten thousand men had rallied to the Royal standard at Stirling, induced the States-General to send for Middleton and express a desire to help him. As a result of the interview their officers were ordered to assist in the transportation of supplies from Amsterdam, and by December 1653 eleven hundred arms and forty barrels of powder were despatched to Scotland.[2]

1653 July September December

Middleton, at the end of his resources, protested that he could do no more, and Charles thereupon appealed to his sister. 'Though I am very unwilling to speake to you in any matter of money,' he wrote, 'yett, if General Middleton be come to the Hague and in distresse, as I doubt he is—and I must tell you he is so modest that he will endure much before he makes his wants knowne—I could wish that you were able to relieve him, for he is the person upon whom the whole businesse of Scotland depends.'

In the next month he wrote again to Heenvliet, the Princess's steward, to ask for the loan of her credit in order to purchase a further supply of arms.

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 299; xlvi. fol. 55. *Holland Papers*, R.O., clix., April 1653.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 1. *Thurloe Papers*, i. p. 463.

1654 January

'The payment for the armes will not be requyred before a year expyre,' he added; 'and before that time, I do give you my word, I will discharge the debts. For out of the first money I shall receave from Germany, which is now out of doubt, I will cause that 2000 rix-dollars to be paid into your hand.'[1]

The Princess was willing to help her brother, but she was also fearful of offending the States, and, guided by the wary Heenvliet, she refused to pledge her credit, which was already strained to the uttermost. At the same time she and her steward gave Middleton all the assistance in their power, exacting as a condition a promise of absolute secrecy.

This prudent course naturally subjected her to the sharp criticism of her brother's friends. It was said that she had not only refused to pledge her credit, but had even denied Middleton 'the small sum' of £1000, without which he could scarcely 'make shift' to transport himself to Scotland, and the condemnation of her selfishness was general and severe. The Princess bore all in silence, but Middleton, unable to endure the aspersions cast upon her, at last broke his promise of secrecy and confessed that he had received from her 5000 guilders in money.

February

Thus provided, he set sail for Scotland early in February 1654, with his meagre supplies, and his following of Scottish, English, Dutch, and German officers, to the number of a hundred, including Sir George Monroe, his second in command, and Montrose's nephew, Lord Napier.[2]

1652

In the meantime events had occurred which rendered the Scottish general's task even harder than it had appeared at the outset. Glengarry, though 'honest and stout,' was 'neither a soldier nor a wise man,' and his success had not been answerable to Charles's expectation.[3] True the activity of the Highlanders during the whole

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fols. 177, 237.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. pp. 52, 60, 62. *Thurloe Papers*, ii. p. 67. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 220, 221.

[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 122.

winter of 1652 had obliged Monk's deputies, Robert Lilburne and Colonel Deane, to abandon the attempt to subdue them, but they had accomplished nothing further. In the spring the promised army was still a thing of the future, and Charles, in great disappointment, wrote rather resentfully to Middleton : 1652

'Who would have thought, after so much discourse of an army in the Highlands that had taken Inverness and would quickly drive all the English out of the kingdom, that there should indeede be no men there but such who lodge in their owne bedds, and only project what they will do when they are able.'[1] 1653 March

Another ground of uneasiness, almost more serious than the lack of an army, was the presence of the Presbyterian Colonel Bampfylde in the Highlands. This intriguing colonel had enjoyed the confidence of Charles I. and had at his instigation contrived the escape of the Duke of York.[2] Being subsequently disappointed of the rewards and esteem he expected, he had deserted the service of Charles II. and now began an infamous career as a spy of the English Commonwealth. Anne Murray, to whom he was for some years betrothed, and whom he treated no better than he treated other unsuspecting friends, describes him in distinctly favourable terms. 'He was,' she says, 'unquestionably loyal, handsome, a good skollar—which gave him the advantage of writing and speaking well—and the chiefest ornament he had was a decent life and conversation ; att least hee made it apeare such to mee ; and whatsoever misfortune hee brought upon mee I will doe him that right as to acknowledge. I learnt from him many excellent lessons of piety and vertue, and to abhor and detest all kinds of vice.'[3]

This testimony to his virtue comes somewhat oddly from a woman whom he had wooed, and beguiled into an engagement while he yet had a wife living ; but Anne

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv., 21st March 1653. [2] See page 43.

[3] *Autobiography*, Camden Society, new series, xiii. p. 26.

1653 was not the only person deceived by his extreme plausibility. Bampfylde had a great gift of hypocrisy, and when he came to Scotland in the spring of 1653, armed with old letters of credit from the King, he speedily gained the confidence of the rough Highland chiefs. That confidence he betrayed as speedily to Cromwell and Argyle.[1] Lord Balcarres, to whom he particularly commended himself, could not sufficiently extol his
April 'diligence' in the King's service, and in April 1653 he was chosen by the chiefs as the most fitting envoy to send to the King. A letter, written by Seaforth in the name of all the rest, commended him to Charles's notice in terms of the highest praise:

'Because that your Majesty may have a more full and exact account than any letter can bear, we thought it most expedient to employ this noble gentleman, Colonel Bampfylde, your Majesty's most faithful servant, to waite upon your Majesty to that effect. There is nobody can give your Majesty so perfect an information of all things as he, for he hath been incredibly active and industrious in your Majesty's service, sparing no labour, how difficult and troublesome soever, in going through all our country. There is nothing wherewith he is not intimately acquainted, as having been exceedingly instrumental in carrying on your Majesty's service. And with all is to be said of our proceedings, our intentions, our humble desires, and our opinions, in all that relates to your Majesty's affairs.'[2]

Charles, who was already aware of Bampfylde's treachery, received this letter with a consternation which can be better imagined than described.

He had previously written to Balcarres: 'As for Bampfylde it is not possible for me to repose any confidence in him . . . since I know more ill of him than anybody can know good.'

At the same time he despatched to Middleton a

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. pp. 7, 21. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fols. 82, 108.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fols. 322, 324.

warrant for the traitor's arrest, which he urged him to forward in all haste to Scotland, 'for the preventing of the mischief which Bampfylde will every day doe.' But the mischief was done. Bampfylde had left Scotland before the warrant arrived, and it only remained for Charles to renew his warnings to Balcarres and Glengarry, and to assure them that Bampfylde's actions had been wholly unauthorised.[1] 1653

Meanwhile the plausible Colonel went first to Denmark, and thence to Holland, where his exaggerated accounts of the Royalist forces gained for Middleton a tardy assistance from the States. In September, having sent the King 'a large letter' in his own justification, he proceeded to Paris, with Captain Shawe and Colonel Macleod, and presented to Hyde a paper of advice concerning Scottish affairs. He also counselled him to detain Captain Shawe in France, lest he should confide over much in the Scottish Chancellor, Loudoun, 'who,' said the Colonel, 'may have a back door to returne at, if there be but weake hopes of assistance.' Hyde had little enough faith in Loudoun, but less in Bampfylde, who soon discovered that he was 'looked upon as a knave' in the King's Court, and became 'very melancholique' in consequence. Yet it was not in Charles's power to shake Balcarres's confidence in him, and through Balcarres he gained the favour of Jermyn and other members of the Presbyterian faction. For many months he remained about the Court, proving himself 'a good friend to the Parliament' by betraying all the secrets of the Highlands, with much else besides. His usefulness to his employers was, however, slightly discounted by the fact that he invariably told them a great deal more than he knew.[2] September

It was perhaps owing to Bampfylde's treachery that a premature discovery of their plans forced the Scottish

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, 21st March 1653, xlv. fol. 195; xlvii. fols. 221, 223.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 16. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fols. 135, 137, 254, 280. *Thurloe*, i. pp. 463, 480, 630.

1653 June Royalists to take to the hills in June 1653. There their numbers swelled rapidly, and by the end of the next month thirteen earls and barons, including Huntly, Seaforth, Athol, Balcarres, and Loudoun, had offered their swords to the King. Several of these were Lowland lairds of the straitest sect of the Covenanters, whom the pressure of the English confiscations had caused to renounce their recent capitulations and return to the Royalist alliance. The most rigid among them held the Highlanders a degree less obnoxious than the English invaders, and the Resolutioners had never August ceased to pray for the King. In August they were further reinforced by the adhesion of Lorne and his brother. Lorne, having quarrelled with his father, now joined the Royalist forces, vowing an undying devotion to his sovereign, 'should it cost him all he valued most on earth.' Charles had vowed, on his part, never to trust Argyle again, but he accepted the protestations of his sons, and assured them that their father's sins should never be laid to their account.[1]

It was the King's hope and intention to unite all parties under the Royalist banner, and as early as August 1652 he had addressed a pious exhortation to the moderator of the General Assembly soliciting the co-operation and support of the Kirk. In February 1654 he sent a second epistle to the same effect, requesting, with great earnestness, that only 'discreet' ministers should be sent to join the army; and on the same day he wrote to Middleton:

'I cannot forget the spirit of some men when I was there; and except you can send me word it was either reformed, or made less able to do mischeife, it will be a great discouragement to me.'[2]

The desired assurance was sent from Scotland, some months later, by one of Middleton's officers:

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 15. *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 44; xlv. fol. 324; xlvi. fol. 36; xlvii. fols. 8, 9.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliii. fol. 226; xlvii. fols. 343, 353.

'For your comfort, Mr. Presbyter's never likely to put his oar in our boate; at least not to sit at the helm as formerly he hath done.'[1] 1653 June

The day of the Kirk was past, and the danger lay now in a new direction. The Highlanders were ready to receive all who would fight for the King, but they were neither ready nor able to lay aside their private jealousies and animosities as the King exhorted them to do. Only one man—Montrose—had been able to bind them together into the semblance of a united army; Montrose was dead, and the leader sent to fill his place was not equal to the task. When the Royalists asked for a general in 1652, Charles's choice had lighted on William Cunninghame, Earl of Glencairn, a Lowlander, whose lands had been seized by Argyle. In June 1653 Glencairn came to the Highlands, armed with the King's commission to himself, and with that other commission issued in December 1652, authorising the chiefs to choose their own commander. Tactfully suppressing his own commission, Glencairn showed only that to the chiefs, with the satisfactory result that he was himself elected general during Middleton's absence. He immediately issued a declaration that his army fought to avenge the murdered King, to restore his heir, to defend religion from sectaries, and the country from 'a servile bondage.' He wound up with an impassioned appeal to his countrymen, to shake off the yoke of 'strangers and servants,' adjuring them by the examples of Wallace and Bruce, and warning them, as Mordecai warned Esther: 'If thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise from another place; but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed.'[2]

Some seven thousand men rallied to his standard, and he, well aware that he was no match for Lilburne in the south, divided his forces, and contented himself with

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 277.

[2] *Ibid.* xliv. fol. 57; xlvii. fol. 24. *Thurloe*, i. pp. 511-12.

1653 horse-stealing, and nightly raids. As the autumn wore on his men grew bolder and descended lower. A successful raid was made on Falkland, Edinburgh was forced to guard herself by night, horses were taken from the neighbourhood of Berwick, and the English on the borders showed a disposition to join with the High-
December landers.[1] In December the Royalists were further elated by the successful adventure of a certain Colonel Wogan, who brought reinforcements from England.

Edward Wogan is described by Hyde as 'a beautiful person of the age of three or four-and-twenty.' As a mere boy he had served the Parliament under Ireton, but had later repented of his conduct and joined Hamilton in 1648. In the next year he commanded Ormonde's guards in Ireland, and in 1651 he came with Ormonde to Paris. When the news of the Highland rising reached France Wogan earnestly besought the King's leave to join it with as many of the young men about the Court as he could induce to accompany him. Charles, aware that he intended to pass through England, endeavoured to dissuade him from so rash an enterprise, but yielded at last to his importunity and granted the permission desired. Wogan, much elated, flew to the Chancellor for the necessary passes and despatches, but here he encountered another check. Hyde pointed out to him that his proposed adventure was now 'the discourse of the town' and must already have reached the ears of Cromwell. On this ground he refused to make out the despatches, and enlarged on the dishonour that would accrue to the King if he suffered his subjects to rush thus madly on their ruin. Wogan replied 'with expressions of contempt of the danger, and confidence of going through with it, but with no kind of reason—which was a talent that did not abound in him—to make it appear probable.' Hyde, still unconvinced, declared his intention of appealing to the King to withdraw his permission for the journey, and though Wogan entreated him with

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 150.

tears not to interfere, the appeal was made. But eventually the younger man's passionate craving for adventure, and his violent protestations that he could not 'outlive the disappointment' carried the day. The King insisted that the despatches should be made, and Hyde could but obey.[1] 1653

On the very next day Wogan set out for Calais with some seven or eight companions. They landed at Dover and proceeded safely to London, where they stayed some days, buying horses and enlisting other young men in their band. On the 20th of November Wogan wrote thence to Ormonde :— November

'The reason I have not writt all this time past was fearing least the letters should be stopt, and to avoid the danger of being knowne to be in these parts. My businesse heare is to be don, butt not by those I expected. To-morrow morning I intend to beginne my journey towards my friends, with one and twenty in my company, and by the helpe of God, I dout not butt that I shall come to my journey's end saffe, with as manye more.'[2]

His extraordinary confidence was fully justified. Disguised as soldiers of the Commonwealth, avoiding the high roads, and marching in small bands of two or three together, he and his companions entered Scotland unmolested, and joined Glencairn in December 1653. December

'And it's certain,' reported a London newsletter, 'that Colonel Wogan came over to this toune from France, and mounted fifty gentlemen in this toune, and marched through all England, 2 and 3 together, till they came near Scotland, mette at their rendez-vous, beate up a quarter of ours, and are now joyned, 60 horse, with the Highlanders. This gives the drooping malignants a little life.'

The young Colonel was received with enthusiasm, and 'reverenced' as a hero in the little army, but he did not

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. pp. 59-61.
[2] *Thurloe*, i. p. 607.

1654 January

live long to enjoy the fame that his exploit had won him. Within a few weeks of his arrival he was wounded in an insignificant skirmish, and the wound, by no means fatal in itself, 'for want of a good surgeon,' proved mortal to him.[1]

Throughout January 1654 the Royalists continued cheerful and sanguine. 'I thank God,' wrote one of them, 'our armie doth increase every day, and doth expect the gentleman from beyond sea ourly.'

In the same month they ventured within three miles of Ruthven Castle, and the Governor, though he described their forces as consisting only of 'starved men' and 'poor horses,' plainly felt some uneasiness. Lilburne conceived the situation so serious that he entreated Monk's return; but Monk was engaged in fighting the Dutch, and his presence in Scotland was not really needed. It was not to be expected that peace and amity could reign long among the Scottish chiefs; already internal dissension was breaking up their forces, and there was but too much truth in the King's warning: 'The enemy more depends upon the divisions and animosities among you, than upon his own strength.'[2]

Before the first month of the campaign was over Lorne had quarrelled with both Kenmure and Glengarry, and he now parted from Glencairn in bitter anger. Their dispute concerned the men of Ruthven, whom Lorne claimed as his father's vassals. Glencairn retorted that, though Argyle had seized the rents, the men were truly Huntly's men. 'Whereupon high words arose between them, and Glencairn offered to draw his sword, and Lorne went away in a great rage, swearing that rather than see his own people abused by Glencairn he would lose his life.'

That night he crossed the water with Mackeldney and a few Macgregors. On the next night—after an attempt to procure Glencairn's murder—he fled, with only eight

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 150, 174; xlviii. fol. 277. Whitelocke's *Memorials*, 24th January, 17th February 1654.

[2] *Thurloe*, i. p. 495; ii. p. 3.

horse in his company. Glencairn sought to arrest him in vain; great divisions arose in the army, and several of the leaders followed Lorne's example.[1] 1654

From that time Lorne seems to have been reconciled with his father, and in February 1654 he endeavoured to justify Argyle's conduct to the King. 'I am very sorry their Majesties have so hard thoughts of my father,' he wrote to a correspondent. 'He hath (been), and I am persuaded will be, ready at all occasions to prove himself a loyall subject and a very true well-wisher of the King and all his family. And if I thought my father meant otherwise than he professes, and were, as some have been pleased to call him, an enemy to the King's Majesty, I would not only differ from him in opinion, but would also quit all the interest I have in him.' But Charles's distrust of Argyle was too deeply rooted to be shaken, and news sent by Middleton in March confirmed his suspicions of collusion between father and son.[2] February March

Lorne's secession from the army was followed by that of Balcarres. In August 1653 Balcarres had endeavoured to wrest the command from Glencairn. Glencairn was forced to produce his commission from the King in self-defence, and from that moment all hope of united action was over. Vainly did Charles write soothing words to his fiery subjects, entreating them to 'lay aside all misunderstandings and join heartily together.' Vainly did he beseech Glencairn to conciliate Balcarres and Balcarres to make peace with Glencairn. 'And I must do Glencairn the justice to tell you that all his letters to me have been full of commending you,' he assured Balcarres. 1653 August October

'I am sure they have all enough to do, and there is a part large enough for Balcarres to act if he likes to undertake it,' averred Lord Newburgh.

But the rivals refused to be soothed. In November Balcarres obtained the signatures of some of the chiefs November

[1] *Thurloe*, ii. p. 3. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 45.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 57, 409.

to a memorial undermining Glencairn's authority, and Glencairn at once sent Major Strachan to the King with a request that he would give no credit to any documents emanating from Balcarres.[1]

1654 February

The only remedy for all these evils appeared to be the hastening of Middleton's departure, in the hope that his authority and influence would suppress faction and reunite the Royalists. The private instructions sent to him on February 6th, 1654, bade him do his utmost to please both Glencairn and Glengarry, and Charles, in a letter written in his own hand, adjured him to perform the impossible, and restore peace and concord to the army. 'I need not bidd you to be very solicitous, when you get to them, to make a perfect conjunction between Glencairn and Balcarres, the difficulty of which businesse I suppose you will find well over, by what I have written to both and by what Will Drummond, and other of his friends, have said to them from me. Ther is nothing you must labour in more than to prevent and reconcile all differences and animosities amongst those who wish well to me and to my businesse, and to suppresse those who, upon any pretence soever of affection to my service endeavour to kindle jealousy among my friends and to crosse those wayes and to oppose those persons which I have designed for the conduct of my affairs. All wise men must consider that I must not only depend upon the assistance of my own subjects in all my dominions of what opinion soever, . . . but must hope for supplyes from all my allyes of what religion soever, and therefore all acts must be avoyded which may give umbrage or rayse jealousies among them. And no sober man can doubt that, when God shall restore me, I will governe my people, as a good King ought to do, by his lawes, and will provide remedyes that way for anything that is amiss. I shall stay here very little longer, and shall provide myself for action the best way I can, . . . and be confidant that, if upon the consideration of affairs my

[1] *Thurloe*, i. pp. 495, 502. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 189.

presence shall be most necessary with you, I will make hast to you and accompany you in any danger and distresse you may be forced to undergo.'[1]

1653 Middleton must have been aware that the task required of him was beyond his powers, but before his arrival in the Highlands one source of difficulty had been removed by the departure of Balcarres. His secession, sooner or later, was inevitable, but it had been hastened by an accusation of treason brought against his brother-in-law, Sir Robert Moray.

December In December 1653 Moray's accuser, Lady Page, wife of Sir Richard Page, forwarded to Paris the copy of a letter which she professed to have found in the lodgings of the Earl of Dysart—formerly known as Will Murray. The letter purported to be addressed by Moray to Dysart, and contained dark hints of a plot to murder the King. Dysart was apparently required to furnish the chosen assassin with funds, and his correspondent concluded with the remark: 'I have never yet seene a man undertake a businesse with that cheerfulnesse. Our friends here do assure me that he will finde no hard task in the matter by reason that sometymes for his pleasure he goes so slightly garded.'[2]

Lady Page's account of her discovery was most circumstantial. She stated that she had visited Dysart in Antwerp, and, 'the weather proving very foule,' had remained in his rooms for shelter, after her host had left the house with a friend. She had then accidentally lighted on the fateful letter lying on the bed. She was herself unable to read it; but, for a reason which she did not explain, she suspected something wrong, and therefore conveyed the document to the Marquis of Newcastle. The Marquis, having read it, informed her that it was 'of dangerous consequence,' and advised her to communicate with the King. For this purpose she had the letter copied, but Dysart recovered the original

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 258, 343.
[2] *Ibid.* xlvii. fol. 95.

1654 January-February through the copyist, and she was therefore unable to produce it. This was the weak point in her evidence, but her story was duly corroborated by her husband.[1]

Dysart, on his side, denied all knowledge of the letter, and the King, though he neither loved nor trusted him, was content to believe it a forgery. Robert Moray, an honourable man of upright life, and held in universal esteem, was most unlikely to have been the author of any such scheme. Bishop Burnet, indeed, expressly states that the whole affair was concocted by Glencairn in order to break Moray's credit with the army. But if, as he also asserts, Lady Page was really a cast-off mistress of Dysart, it is more probable that she invented the plot herself out of personal spite. It was, however, Glencairn who profited in the event by seizing
April the chance to reduce the number of his rivals. Moray was placed under arrest; and Balcarres, burning with wrath, came over to France.[2]

The Queen and Jermyn received him sympathetically, but his inclination for Argyle, and his 'unreasonable disaffection' to Glencairn, caused Charles to regard him
May with coldness. 'It is a strange, fatal spirit that rages among us,' reflected Hyde; 'I find this lord not satisfied with my Lord Glencairn, but full of jealousies, and I know not what. He seems to have a just esteem of Middleton, yet would have I know not what limitation of his power. In a word, it is a very hard nature to please.'[3]

February Middleton had sailed from Holland saddened by the knowledge that his coming must needs be a disappointment to the Highlanders, who looked to him for supplies of arms and money, and possibly the support of a Dutch fleet. Yet he did not shrink from the troubles before him, and the end of February brought him to land at

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 317, 319; xlviii. fol. 34.

[2] *Ibid.* xlvii. fol. 278, 407. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 235. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 27. Burnet's *Own Times*, i. p. 101.

[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 165.

Tarbatness. The wintry weather secured him from molestation, but rendered his march hard and dangerous. Nevertheless he struggled bravely onward, passing over almost 'inaccessible' places, climbing rocks and wading rivers with unfailing courage. 'Duty and loyalty made it easy, and the example of the Lieutenant-General warmed us so thoroughly that it was impossible for any man's resolution to be chilled,' declared one of his English officers. 1654

In Sutherland they at last found Glencairn, Glengarry, Athol, Kenmure, and one or two more, with a force of between two and three thousand men, of which only five hundred were cavalry. The Commander-in-Chief was received with much cordiality, but he quickly perceived that the Scottish chiefs, though 'very gallant,' were ignorant and uneducated, that their army was 'but a rude chaos,' and that all the accounts of it sent to Holland had been a mere 'romance.'[1] March

His efforts reduced the heterogenous forces to some order, but it was not long before fresh quarrels broke out. Kenmure spoke slightingly of the General in his cups, and was deprived of his command. A few days later he was restored on his apology, but a disagreement with Glencairn had more serious consequences. The Earl was 'no soldier,' but he was the best-loved leader in the army, and though he had reluctantly submitted to be superseded by Middleton, he could not endure to take rank below Monroe. A quarrel begun at dinner between these two ended in a duel. Glencairn wounded and disarmed his adversary, and then, resenting Middleton's support of Monroe, left the camp with five hundred men.[2] April

Thus had Middleton's arrival widened, rather than healed the breaches in the army, and Charles wrote to both the disputants despairingly:

'What can I think of these distempers but that there

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 277.

[2] *Ibid.* xlix. fol. 212, 277. *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 57.

1654 is a judgment upon us that will not suffer us to come together; for what confidence can I have that any will agree when you two fall from one another?'[1]

Before the words were penned the cause had been hopelessly lost. Middleton had done his best, but with small success, despite the constant rumours of victory that reached the exiled Court, and when Monk arrived in April 1654 to take over the command from the inefficient Lilburne, the end was a foregone conclusion.

May On the 4th of May the Protectorate was formally proclaimed; on the 5th an Act of pardon and grace was published, granting an amnesty to all who laid down their arms within twenty days. From this the Royalist leaders were excluded, and a price of £200 was set upon the heads of Middleton, Seaforth, Kenmure, and Dalziel.[2]

This last clause was regarded by the Royalists as rather encouraging than otherwise, for, explained Hyde: 'If anything had happened amiss, the rebels would be sure to give us notice of it, and since they value you at so high a rate as to promise £200 to any man to cut your throat, it is an even lay—they being naturally thrifty managers—that they believe you are like to put them to £300 charges extraordinary, if they do not, by such a compendious way, cut you off. But such a vile sum will be contemned in the Highlands.'[3]

Middleton was himself comparatively hopeful. The greater number of those who had anything at stake, beyond their lives, had preferred to accept the offered amnesty, but many 'younger sons and desperat persons' still clung to the Royalist cause. On these the General built his hopes, and on the 30th of May 1654 he wrote cheerfully to both the King and the Chancellor from Wick, in Caithness. After apologising for his long silence, on the plea that his news could but have added

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlix. fol. 39.
[2] *Ibid.* xlviii. fol. 263. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 249.
[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 285.

'afflictions to the afflicted,' he assured them that the prospect was now improved, and begged the King to join the army speedily, according to his promise.

'Your Majesty will meet with no such desperat game as be manie is represented . . . and indeed nothing but your Majesty's presence can carry on this work,' he protested.[1]

Many others shared Middleton's opinion; and one of his English officers had previously protested that only the King's coming could raise the affair above a mere Highland raid.

'I should rather he should fall gloriously, attempting his right in his own person, than live with the opprobry the world will cast on him if he appear not in his owne,' added the writer. 'I am of opinion that it were farre more honourable for him to be master of any the least spot of ground in his kingdoms than to be at the devotion of others for bread.'

In June Athol added his entreaties, declaring that the King's presence was earnestly desired, and as late as August Colonel Strachan sent another appeal.

'Lay ye weet, lay ye dray, I shall be with yowe,' he vowed. . . . 'And Lord grant this woag a blissing for Jesus Christy's caus, and let Cromwell geo hang himself!'[2]

Charles, moved by these epistles, constantly declared his intention of going to Scotland, declaring that he would 'rather dye with his sword in his hand' than of 'distresses,' or than continue to 'sit still and dream out his life.' But those around him feared to permit the risk, and he yielded to their persuasions to delay and wait upon events until it was too late to take any action at all.[3]

While Middleton strove to collect cavalry, ere he

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 247. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 67.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fols. 271, 277. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 79, 4th August 1654.

[3] *Thurloe*, ii. p. 574. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 193.

1654 descended to the Lowlands, Monk secured the lines of the Forth and Tay, thus cutting off the Royalists' supply of horses, and setting an impassable barrier between the Highlands and Lowlands. Then he marched northJune wards, burning and destroying as he went. In June he followed Middleton into the land of the Campbells, and, after a series of forced marches, compelled him toJuly double back by Loch Rannoch. On the 19th of July the exhausted Royalists were surprised by Colonel Morgan at Dalnaspidal, on the western side of Loch Garry. Middleton ordered retreat, and for some time the English in his rear sustained Morgan's attack with great courage, but eventually the whole force was put to flight. Most of the men made good their escape; all the horses were taken, and the General lost, besides his white charger, his papers, and all the money he possessed.[1]

August Throughout August Monk destroyed the country, intending to reduce it by famine, but in point of fact the war was already over. Athol, Glencairn, and Kenmure obtained passes to go over seas, and leave for their officers to return home 'with their swords'; the faithful Napier made his way to Holland 'in a very sad condition,' and Middleton sought refuge with the Macleods in Skye.[2]

The news of the disaster travelled slowly, and long after all was over, Charles continued to write letters of encouragement and exhortation. On the leaders of the army he enjoined union and forbearance, to the ministers of the kirk he recommended moderation and discretion. 'I doubt not but the memory of my conversation and behaviour amongst you will preserve me from the scandals of all kinds which my enimyes will not fail to rayse against me,' he concluded.

October In October he made an effort to send over letters and supplies to the Highlands, but his emissary found the coasts guarded by English vessels, and was obliged to

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlix. fol. 212. Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, ii. p. 418.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlix. fols. 25, 26. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. pp. 168, 187.

return with his errand unperformed.[1] It was, therefore, not until January 1655 that Charles heard from one of the fugitives, Captain Mewes, that his last hope in Scotland had perished. Middleton lingered in Skye for several months, and in May 1655 there arose a report that he was again in arms. But, in the same month, he moved for his recall, and in June he appeared at Cologne to tell the tale of his disastrous failure.[2]

1655 January

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. pp. 98, 117, 140.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlix. fols. 75, 96-9. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. pp. 187, 283, 288, 293. *Thurloe*, iii. pp. 3, 561.

CHAPTER XVII

The Hopeless Condition of Ireland—The State of England—Persecution of Cavaliers—Puritan Factions—The Revival of Royalism—The Royalists hope for Lambert's Adhesion. Alliance of John Lilburne with Buckingham—General desire for the King's Restoration—Cromwell becomes Protector—Scheme for a new Royalist Insurrection—The Sealed Knot—Bampfylde betrays the Plot—Henshaw's Assassination Plot—The question of Charles's Complicity—Plans of the Conspirators—Failure of the Plot—Escape of Henshaw—Arrest of Gerard and Vowell—Their Execution.

1653 THE contemplation of affairs in England and Ireland was not likely to afford Charles much consolation for the Scottish disasters.

Ireland had been successfully conquered, though not pacified; her sons were slain, banished, or transplanted, and the few 'desperate men' who lingered in the woods and bogs were not capable of organised resistance or
March sustained effort. In March 1653 Charles still had, in Ireland, 'ground enough of his own to set his feet upon,' but in the next month the little band of patriots that still held together in Munster suffered a fatal defeat, and their leader O'Sullivan Beirne fled to France. There the sympathy and succours offered by the French Jansenists stimulated him to fresh efforts. He believed that in the south-west of Munster, the O'Sullivan country, he might yet 'make an impression,' and by
1654 April 1654 he had actually collected a small supply of
April arms and ammunition. Three captains of privateers undertook to transport these stores to Ireland, and to provide the insurgents with cannon from their own ships. But when all was ready came the news that Mortagh

O'Brien, 'the principal foundation' of O'Sullivan's hopes, had been forced to lay down his arms. The expedition was thereupon abandoned; no forces worth considering remained in arms, and so far was the Court from expecting any new rising in Ireland that Ormonde proposed to export the Ulster men to Scotland, and suggested that priests should be sent over to act as recruiting officers.[1] 1654

The situation in England was less desperate, but very far from hopeful. The Cavaliers alienated by the King's alliance with the Covenanters, and depressed by the rigorous measures of the Government, had neither means nor inclination to risk another revolt. Death, banishment, and imprisonment had deprived them of their leaders; fines and confiscations had reduced them to utter poverty; the restrictions, disabilities, and constant supervision to which they were subjected made it both difficult and dangerous for them to meet together, and during the first months that followed the battle of Worcester they remained absolutely quiescent. Yet they were far from being reconciled to their fate; the time wore on, the King, renouncing the covenant by word and deed, turned back to the old Royalist policy, and loyalty began to revive among his friends at home. This revival was stimulated by a fresh persecution from the Government.

In February 1652 an Act of Oblivion was passed for all offences committed before the 3rd of September 1651, but the number of those excepted from it made it a dead letter. The nation needed money; money must therefore be wrung from the already distressed Cavaliers, and on November 1652 a new confiscation bill brought ruin on over six hundred harmless and insignificant victims. This act of injustice goaded the English Cavaliers to desperation, brought new hope to their exiled compatriots, and forced on the inevitable reaction. 1652 February November

It was indeed obvious that the Cavaliers alone could

[1] *Evelyn*, iv. pp. 282, 303. *Thurloe*, i. pp. 562, 626. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 158; xlvi. fol. 87. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 119, 207.

not overthrow the existing Government, but the Cavaliers were not the only discontented party in the State.

The old Lord Astley had been justified of the words spoken to his captors at the end of the first Civil War in 1646.

'You have done your work, and may go play,' he said, as he sat upon a drum on the field of battle, 'unless you will fall out among yourselves.' And the Puritans had fallen out among themselves; already the factious spirit that had brought destruction upon the Royalists was doing the same work among their enemies.

1653 The Assembly which still arrogated to itself the name of Parliament had become a mere venial, selfish oligarchy, hated by the nation, and at variance with the army. The suffering and poverty caused by the Dutch War put the finishing touch to its unpopularity, loud murmurs were raised against it, and the officers threatened to 'bring in the Cavaliers,' whom they knew 'to have a great deal more of honour and honesty' than the members of the Rump.[1]

April In April 1653 the disputes between Army and Parliament culminated in the forcible dissolution of the Parliament, and the assumption of a temporary dictatorship by Cromwell. This measure gave satisfaction to almost all parties in the country, but it did not solve the vexed question of Government. To Leveller and Presbyterian alike the rule of the army was abhorrent, and the army itself was broken up into factions of which Cromwell, Lambert, and Harrison were the respective leaders.

May Lambert, who was extremely popular with the soldiers, advocated constitutional liberty, a new election and free parliamentary government. Harrison the oracle of the Fifth-Monarchy fanatics, would fain have established the arbitrary rule of the 'godly,' among whom he did not include Cromwell. In May 1653 he asserted that 'the spirit told him it was impossible to settle this

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fols. 221, 224.

government but in a monarchical way, and it was revealed unto him that there would speedily be a King again, but not one of the former race, nor such carnal persons as some eminent in present power, but a man after God's own heart, and a King anointed with His Spirit.'

Another preacher, named Freake, declared publicly that Cromwell 'was not the man whom the Lord had chosen'[1]; but while the General had the support of his officers he remained the strongest power in the State, and it was not possible for the malcontents to overthrow him. By many it was believed that he would himself assume the Crown. Others, more sanguine, credited him with a design to restore Charles, and it was rumoured that Mazarin had advised the King to marry Cromwell's daughter, make his father-in-law a duke, and provide for all his friends and kindred with lands, offices, and titles.[2] This was, of course, mere fable, but as early as December 1651 Whitelocke had actually proposed to fix a day on which the government might be handed over to Charles or James, with all due restrictions and safeguards. The idea failed to commend itself to Cromwell, though later he was thought to have some intention of crowning the little Duke of Gloucester, who remained a prisoner of the Commonwealth. If he ever seriously entertained the notion he soon abandoned it in favour of taking the crown himself, but Whitelocke, to whom he hinted his design, discouraged it, and the matter fell into abeyance.

In the meantime the Royalist revival grew with the growing divisions of the Puritans.

'Our distractions here are great, and each one's wishes are for our Master, but few so hardy as to embrace the occasion,' reported a cavalier. '. . . It breaks my heart to be out of action, and to live under a power that is so hateful to me.'

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 380.
[2] *Ibid.* xlv. fol. 398. *Thurloe*, i. p. 255.

And a minister of Derby dared to preach openly against rebellion, telling his congregation that 'as they had joined in driving out this good young King, so they must join as one man, hearts and hands to bring him in again, for till then they must never expect to see good days in England.'[1]

In this condition of affairs Cromwell betrayed a desire to conciliate the cavaliers, and became 'very kind to the old malignant party,' promising 'to give them more cause to love him soon.' But 'the obstinacy of the Royalists' was 'not to be satisfied by any of his civility,' and the attempt failed signally.[2]

The Royalist hopes were set rather upon Lambert, who was known to have private grievances against Cromwell, and whose political views would certainly lead him to oppose his General's assumption of the regal title.

'Lambert is the unfathomed man, and if there be any opposition it will probably proceed from—or at least be backed by—him. For without such a countenance it will be above the courage of the old members or their malcontents to endeavour anything, though they are knocking their noodles together and designing something,' was the dictum of one newsletter.

Others went further, and believed that Lambert might be gained for the King. Because, they argued, 'he had not his hands immediately in the last King's blood; he is not severely of any opinion in religion inconsistent with monarchy, neither is his interest made up of any such. He is a gentleman born, and many of his kindred and friends firmely of that (*i.e.* the Royalist) party. He is a man learned and well qualified, of courage, conduct, good-nature and discretion.'[3]

Their hopes were doomed to disappointment, for Lambert despite his discontent, adhered to Cromwell,

[1] *Thurloe*, i. p. 240. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 398.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 356, 380.
[3] *Ibid.* xlv. fol. 380, 398.

and became the ruling spirit in the new Council of State, established by the army in 1653. 1652 January

Rather more reasonable were the expectations built on the attitude of the Levellers. John Lilburne, their prophet and leader, had declared in favour of an hereditary monarchy, if monarchy there must be. In January 1652, being banished from England, he came to Bruges, and there talked much of a Stuart restoration, based on levelling principles, such as he had formerly proposed in 1649.[1]

His sincerity was at first suspected. 'I have a jealousie that his banishment is but counterfeit, and to give him an opportunity of doing mischief in Holland,' wrote Lord Hopton's chaplain. But the suspicion was unjust, and Lilburne soon found many of the exiles willing to listen to his projects. He boasted that not only the nation at large, but the greater part of the army and navy would rise for the King at his bidding. He promised to raise 40,000 men, and declared that with the sum of £10,000, he could overthrow Cromwell, the Parliament, and the Council of State in the space of half an hour. February

'And I am told,' wrote Nicholas to Hatton, 'that Lord Percy and some others here are of opinion that Lilburne is more able to set the Crown on the King's head than ever Scotland was, if his Majesty will but follow his advice.'[2]

Not only Percy, but Buckingham, Hopton, Culpepper and Dr. Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, had entered into an alliance with the Leveller. July

'Here are a parsell of strange people come to town, mixt, as we think, of the Presbyterian and Levelling parties,' wrote a Royalist from Bruges at the end of July 1652. 'Lilburne and some other of them have close consultation with the Duke of Buckingham. That they have some design in hand I have for certain from one of the pack that pretends to be very honest, and

[1] See p. 133.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, Watson to Edgeman, 20th February 1652. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 291. *Gardiner*, ii. p. 242.

1652 will contract acquaintance with me; as much at least as I will let him.'[1]

August In August the same cabal had moved to Ghent, and Hopton convinced, like Hyde, that Lilburne 'would never do the King any good,' severed his connection with it. The rest remained sanguine, but it was to Buckingham especially that the strange alliance commended itself. Lilburne made a boast of his friendship, and even went so far as to write to the Council of State in the Duke's behalf.

1653 June 'Would you imagine that the Duke of Buckingham and Lilburne should be such intimates that Lilburne should, by letter to the Council of State, give a most high character of him, as a person both conscientious and honourable?' queried a newsletter.

The thing was not easy to imagine, nor was Lilburne's recommendation likely to do Buckingham, or any one else, much good. The two were strongly suspected of hatching a plot for the murder of Cromwell, but neither that, nor any other of their projects, came to an issue, for in June 1653 the Leveller's career was summarily cut short. He imprudently ventured to return to England, was promptly arrested, and, though convicted of no crime, was indefinitely detained a prisoner 'for the peace of the nation.'[2]

July Thus perished another Royalist hope, but the Royalist reaction was not checked, and when Cromwell's nominated Parliament met in July 1653 it was already in full swing. Anglican 'conventicles,' till lately so rigidly suppressed, were increasing rapidly, and the King's restoration had become common talk.

'Every blew-aproned fellow dares to talk it almost publicly in the streets, and the boys sing prophane ballads of his Excellency (*i.e.* Cromwell). Besides Prophet Evans puts him daily in mind of it, and

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliii. fol. 217.

[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 791. *Clarendon MSS.*, xliii. fol. 277; xlvi. fol. 31. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 13. *Gardiner*, ii. p. 251.

proffers himself to be hanged if that the King be not among us yet before winter,' said the newsletters.[1] 1653

The Presbyterians, 'having no other probable way to preserve themselves,' had now declared openly for the King, but professed themselves discouraged by his silence and inaction. They proposed, therefore, that he should issue a declaration against the present tyranny, reminding the nation of the concessions made by his father, reiterating his own intention of ruling according to law when he should be restored, and promising to permit liberty of worship to all, so far as such liberty should not prove 'destructive to peace.' He was also required to assure their arrears of pay to the soldiers, and to disown those of his own followers who were not 'eminent for holynesse and righteousnesse,' in particular Jermyn, Culpepper, and Sir Henry Wood. By a curious paradox Rupert, Ormonde, Gerard, Nicholas, and Craven were held to possess the necessary qualification.[2]

Still more significant was the fact that when Colonel Phelips and Major Fry were arrested in August 1653 on the charge of conspiring against the Commonwealth no jury could be found to convict them. To meet this difficulty in future cases, the Government devised a new Court of Justice, qualified to try and convict political offenders after a more arbitrary fashion. August

In December 1653 the nominated Parliament resigned its powers to Cromwell, and a new constitution, known as the 'Instrument of Government,' appointed him Protector of the realm, with a Council of twenty-one members. By a special clause in the 'instrument,' 'Popery' and 'Prelacy' were excluded from toleration. But nothing availed to stem the ebbing tide of Puritanism. Harrison refused to own the Protector, and was deprived of his commission. Levellers and Fifth-Monarchists thundered against Cromwell, and in February 1654 the city received him in sullen silence. December 1654 February

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 482.
[2] *Ibid.* xlv. fol. 434.

1653 September — Less encouragement would have sufficed to incite the Royalists to plot afresh. In September 1653 Charles, therefore, sent over Nicholas Armorer to investigate the condition of the Cavaliers and assist in reorganising their party. In December Armorer reported that all was 'in a fair readiness' for some new attempt, but begged the King to appoint trustworthy persons for the management of his affairs in England. Charles answered him that he would readily authorise any agents chosen by those upon the spot, and thenceforth the committee which had hitherto engineered the Royalist plots was superseded by a new and more active body, called 'the Sealed Knot.'[1]

December

1654 April — The first plot begun under the new auspices proved wholly abortive, and only revealed to the Government the existence of a secret organisation in the country, but in April 1654 Armorer gave a hopeful account of his mission. He had agents in Ludlow, Shrewsbury, Tynemouth, and Worcester, and all these towns were ready to declare for the King if they were encouraged by Middleton's success in Scotland. In Yorkshire Lord Bellasys, Lord Willoughby, and a Mr. Davison were labouring diligently for the cause, and it was hoped Colonel Overton, governor of Hull, might be induced to betray his trust to the King. At the same time Armorer confessed himself hampered by want of money and by the necessity of dealing with persons whom he did not wholly trust. 'I wish I had not, but at the time there was no remedy,' he lamented.

Charles at once wrote to Overton, expressing his readiness to let present services condone for past offences, and he also addressed letters of encouragement to Willoughby and to the Sealed Knot.

'The King is as sollicitous as you could wish, and goes himself on his own errands, which will do it at last,' wrote Hyde to Rochester.[2]

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. pp. 22, 30. *Gardiner*, ii. pp. 426-7.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fols. 92, 119, 122; 155-60.

In the spring the Royalists' spirits were somewhat damped by the death of Lord Beauchamp, 'an unspeakable loss' to the west country, and by the conclusion of peace between England and the United Provinces, but their schemes were not abandoned, and on the 1st of May Hyde wrote earnestly: 1654 May

'Something must be attempted at home by the courage and virtue of those who are weary of ye servitude they live under, and if this can be so ordered that in several places at once some considerable attempt may be made the rebels may be distracted, and friends abroad (may) give more assistance than can be positively undertaken or promised.'

Such a conspiracy as Hyde suggested was, in fact, already spread throughout the country, and on the 22nd of May Charles issued his instructions to the Sealed Knot. He professed his entire confidence in its members, authorised them to appoint such leaders in the various counties as they saw fit, directed them to raise the needful funds in England, and suggested that a successful attempt on London 'would cover all.' He added a promise that, when the rising was begun, he himself, or his brother James, would come over to take command.

But the plot had been already revealed to the Council of State partly by the confession of some London tradesmen and partly through information supplied by the traitor Bampfylde. The Londoners, being arrested, confessed to a design to collect horses and arms, seize Cromwell, and proclaim the King.[1] Further details were supplied by Bampfylde in a paper entitled 'The Condition and Designments of the Titular King of Scots.' He explained that Charles had renounced the Presbyterians and now relied wholly on the Cavaliers, because letters from England warned him that his last failure had been due to his Presbyterian policy. The present scheme was to raise money among the Loyalists, who contributed

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fols. 163, 212. *Thurloe*, ii. p. 330.

1654 May between fourteen and fifteen thousand pounds a year, to reorganise the Royalist party and to win over a considerable part of the army. On a fixed day a general rising was to take place throughout the country, and certain garrisons were to be seized. The men needed to secure Newcastle were to be brought over in the collier vessels, the capture of Carlisle would easily follow, and the north of England and south of Scotland would rise for the King. The care of the west had been intrusted to Henry Seymour, Robert Phelips, John Ashburnham, and Colonel John Digby. These, with Armorer, Edward Villiers, and two other colonels, Morgan and Myvart, were the principal agents in the affair.

The King was observed to meet his emissaries daily at six in the morning in the Tuileries or the Jardin Renard. It was added that the signal for the general rising would be the murder of the Protector.[1]

Bampfylde's information was not always accurate, but it is probable that on this occasion he was not romancing, even in the point of a plot against Cromwell's life. The existence of this plot has been disputed, and those who suffered for it died with a denial on their lips, but, all things considered, it seems impossible to doubt its reality. It must be remembered that the slaying of a regicide did not appear to the Royalists in the light of murder, but rather as a righteous vendetta. Cromwell had slain their King, and must himself be slain, by legal methods preferably, but since they were out of the question, by any other means possible. 'I dare adventure my soul to absolve any resolute spirit that dare undertake it, and surely we have none left, else it had been done before I could take breath to suggest it,' averred Hopton's chaplain.[2] Regicides were indeed beyond the pale, and the murderers of Ascham and Dorislaus had met with universal applause and sympathy. Moreover, the other side had resorted to the same weapons; Monk had officially countenanced murder by offering

[1] *Thurloe*, ii. pp. 510-14. [2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 286.

a reward to the slayers of Middleton and other Scottish leaders, and the Royalists were aware that proposals had been made for the murder of Charles himself. In July 1653, a person describing himself as 'a penitent whose heart God hath touched with sorrow for his former wicket life,' suggested to Cromwell the wholesale murder of 'Charles, James, and Harrie,' promising 'to act such a part therein as shall tell posteritie I loved and honoured you.'[1] To do Cromwell justice, he seems to have treated this and similar communications with scorn, but the Royalists did not do him justice, and they were seriously alarmed for their Sovereign. To many, even of the best among them, it appeared that the death of the Protector would be the most fitting prelude to the general rising, and it is therefore in no way astonishing that there should have existed a plot within a plot to effect the murder. 1654

The question of Charles's complicity is more doubtful. In May 1654 a proclamation, purporting to emanate from the King, offered a reward of £500 per annum to any person who would kill 'a certain base mechanic fellow, by name Oliver Cromwell . . . by pistol, sword, or poison, or by any other way or means whatsoever.'[2] But Charles was most unlikely to have proclaimed his intentions thus publicly, and the proclamation did not bear the marks of his composition. Moreover, it offered pardon to regicides, a thing which Charles never, at any time, brought himself to do. Still more certainly it was not composed by Hyde. The Chancellor was one of the few Royalists who scrupled to murder even a regicide, and when Nicholas reproached him for concealing the plot from him, he answered indignantly: 'It is not reasonable that the projects and designs of loose people, who will never be without such, should be called the designs of the Court, and the loose discourses of them in their debauchery should be thought to be the discovery of the counsels from hence. . . . You tell me you

[1] *Thurloe*, i. p. 312. [2] *Ibid.* ii. p. 248, 319.

1654 have been advertised by three several ways that there are designs to take off Cromwell and his Council, of which you know I am not ignorant, and that several expresses have been with the King about it. I do assure you—upon my credit—I do not know, and—upon my confidence—the King does not—of any such design. Many light, foolish persons propose wild things to the King, which he civilly discountenances, and then they and their friends brag of what they hear or could do.'[1]

Hyde's denial was most explicit, and those accused of the conspiracy died, as has been said, protesting Charles's innocence and their own. On the other hand, Bampfylde asserted that they died with a lie on their lips and gave circumstantial details of their interview with the King.

'Touching what you write concerning the King of Scots, that it is generally believed he had no hand in the design of assassinating the Lord Protector, or that he did not approve of it, and that the belief of it arises from Gerard's declaring of it at his death, I assure you his master is much obliged to him for dying with a falsehood in his mouth for his vindication, and not a little to you for your charity in believing it,' wrote the traitor to the English Secretary of State.[2]

March The facts, so far as they can be ascertained amidst such conflicting evidence, appear to be these: Early in March 1654, there came to Paris a certain Major Henshaw with his half brother John Wiseman, both English officers in the service of Condé. Henshaw obtained an introduction to Rupert, to whom he applied, as he stated, merely for aid in obtaining some petition at the French Court, where he knew the Prince to be 'deservedly esteemed.' Others asserted that he proposed to Rupert a scheme for the murder of Cromwell, and that Rupert thereupon desired to present him to the King. But Charles had been warned that Henshaw corresponded

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 247.

[2] *Thurloe*, ii. p. 533.

with the English Government, and distrusting his intentions, refused to see him. 1654

Thus opens a new question, whether Henshaw was or was not a traitor, and it remains a mystery. He may have merely sent unimportant information to England as a blind, but the trend of events went against him, and his accomplice Gerard, who suffered death while Henshaw escaped in safety, alleged his firm belief that the latter had acted throughout as the decoy of Cromwell himself.[1] It is at least certain that Henshaw made a confidant of Fitz-James, a former Royalist, who had, like Bampfylde, entered the pay of the Commonwealth as a spy upon the King. This man, summoned to Paris by his friend, came thither accompanied by Jack Gerard, a cousin of Lord Gerard. Through his cousin, the younger Gerard easily obtained an introduction to Rupert, was admitted to the Queen's counsels, and finally, as Bampfylde declared, was granted an audience by Charles himself. The interview was described as having taken place in Lord Gerard's room at ten o'clock at night. There were present besides 'Jack' Gerard his two cousins Lord Gerard and Major Gerard, Captain Griffith and Fitz-James. The King talked for some time apart with Jack Gerard and Fitz-James, who assured him that his doubts of Henshaw's 'honesty' were unfounded. It was finally agreed that no immediate attempt should be made on the Protector, but that the assassination should be essayed later, when the Sealed Knot was better prepared for action.[2]

Notwithstanding this, Henshaw and Gerard returned to England in April 1654, and devoted themselves to recruiting men and collecting arms. It was their intention, when the murder had been accomplished, to seize all the horses in London, secure numerous posts of vantage, overpower the guards at Whitehall and April

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlix. fol. 8. *English Historical Review*, 1888, pp. 731-5.

[2] *Thurloe*, ii. p. 533. *Gardiner*, ii. p. 453, note.

1654 St. James's, arrest or kill all the Council of State, but particularly Lambert and Desborough, and force the Lord Mayor to proclaim the King.[1] A general rising was immediately to follow.

In a short time they boasted of having gained large numbers of recruits, chief of whom were Peter Vowell, a schoolmaster of Islington, and Somerset Fox, a relative of the Gerards, who had influence among the city apprentices. Henshaw succeeded in raising seven hundred men, a Colonel Deane had two hundred, and there were large parties ready for action in the city and in Southwark.

It was determined to attack the Protector with three
May hundred men as he went to Hampton Court on the 14th of May, but Cromwell, changing his plans at the last moment, went by water, and so frustrated the design.[2]

The next scheme was to kill him at Council or on his way to chapel, but the delay had proved fatal, and the Government was already in possession of the plot. Though Fitz-James had been drowned as he crossed the Channel to lay his report before Thurloe, other informers had been found to fill his place. It is indeed a question whether Henshaw had not himself betrayed the conspiracy; certainly others besides Bampfylde had sent intelligence of it from France, and a further warning was supplied by a Cavalier who, on hearing of the plot, was seized with horror, and hastened to avert the crime by informing the Protector.[3]

On Sunday, the 21st May 1654, Jack Gerard was arrested with several others, and in the days that followed more than five hundred suspected persons were seized. Henshaw, the originator of the plot, escaped to France, where he drew up a vindication of himself, denying on the one hand that he had ever received money from Cromwell for giving information of any kind, and on the other that any assassination plot had ever existed. He had, he said, merely discoursed vaguely to Gerard 'of

[1] *Thurloe*, ii. p. 416. [2] *Ibid.* ii. pp. 334, 341.
[3] *Ibid.* ii. p. 336. *Gardiner*, ii. p. 460, note.

the possibility the poor enslaved gentry of this nation had of righting the best of Princes.' As for the King, he had been glad to see him in health, and would willingly die for him, but had never spoken to him in his life. Such witnesses as declared anything to the contrary had been 'frighted from truth and flattered from honour.'[1] 1654

This was the view taken by the Londoners, and their fury at the arrests made it very evident that no jury would bring in a true bill against the prisoners. The High Court of Justice was therefore reconstituted, and by it the conspirators were tried, found guilty, and condemned to death. Fox, Charles Gerard, and Wiseman confessed to the plot, and in consideration of their confession their sentence was commuted to transportation. Vowell was hanged at Charing Cross on the morning of July the 10th, and Jack Gerard was beheaded on Tower Hill in the afternoon of the same day. June July

Both protested their innocence with their last breath. Vowell declared that the other conspirators were all unknown to him, that he had never so much as heard of Henshaw, and that he knew only so much of the plot as he had read in the public prints. Gerard acknowledged that he had kissed the King's hand in Paris, and had brought a message to his friends in England, bidding them 'to be quiet, and not engage themselves in any plot which must prove ruinous to them, and could do the King no good.' As to Henshaw's plot, he owned its existence, but denied all complicity with it.

'I know no more about any such design, but only that it was mentioned to me by Henshaw,' he declared on the scaffold. '. . . I debated it twice or thrice when I was with him, but I never entertained it at all, and, at the last, I flatly disowned it.'

The people at least believed in his innocence, and wept in sympathy with him and Vowell.[2]

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlix. fol. 8.

[2] *Thurloe*, ii. pp. 334, 341, 355, 384. *Clarendon*, *History*, xiv. p. 36. Article by Mr. R. Palgrave in *English Historical Review*, 1888, pp. 731-5.

The discovery of this plot proved ultimately a serious check to the other Royalist schemes. In the face of an alert and indignant Government nothing could be attempted; the general rising was postponed from month to month, and no movement occurred until the spring of 1655.

CHAPTER XVIII

The King's Poverty—Sources of Income—Sufferings of the Exiles—Return of the Exiles to Paris—The Queen's Attempt to prevent it—Reasons for Nicholas's Absence—His Discontent—Dissensions at the Louvre—Charles's Hatred of the Scots and Presbyterians—The Queen's Attempt to gain Hyde—Her Hostility to him—Causes of it—Charles and De Retz—Indolence and Instability of Charles's Character—Ormonde supports Hyde—The New Council chosen—Berkeley's Claims—He breaks with Hyde—James of York obtains Leave to join Turenne—Wogan's Accusation of Long—Long's Flight from Court—The factious State of the Court—Charles's inability to control his Followers.

'THE King might well hope that since he had nothing 1652
else left to enjoy, he might have enjoyed quiet and repose, and that a Court which had nothing to give might be free from faction and ambition.' So wrote Sir Edward Hyde; but if Charles indulged in any such hope, he must have been grievously disappointed. 'For,' continued the philosophic Chancellor, 'whilst there are Courts in the world, emulation and ambition will be inseparable from them.'[1] And the exiled Court at Paris was no exception to the rule. The factions that had divided the Royalists in Holland raged in France with unabated fury; private jealousies, multiplying daily, flamed forth in bitter quarrels; the Court of the Queen waged perpetual war with the Court of the King, and the King himself was on bad terms with his mother.

The situation was further complicated by the hopeless poverty which left Charles practically dependent upon

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 145.

1652 Henrietta and Jermyn, through whom alone the French Court could be approached.

The King had returned absolutely destitute. The French pensions of his mother and brother had been, for some time past, rarely and irregularly paid, and the French Court, sufficiently engaged with its own troubles, took no notice of Charles's arrival in Paris.

In February 1652, desperation sent Jermyn to St. Germains, with a demand to know whether it were Louis's pleasure that his aunt and cousins should starve. This picturesque message gained for Charles the grant of a pension of 6000 livres per month, about £6000 per annum, accompanied by a polite regret that the condition of France made it impossible to give more.[1] But this pension, like those of James and Henrietta, was very seldom paid, and when, by much importunity, a few pistoles were wrung from the French Exchequer, they were invariably seized by the Queen's Treasurer for the household expenses, which Charles was required to share equally with his mother.[2]

The only other sources of income were the contributions of the Loyalists in England, and the profits derived from the sale of prizes taken by the King's ships at sea.

The Royalist fleet—so-called—had sailed under Rupert for distant seas in May 1651, and though there were great hopes that much treasure would be eventually derived from the voyage, nothing had been heard of the fleet for many months. There were, however, many privateers who plied their trade in the Channel from the shelter of the Breton ports, and professed to pay to the King a fifteenth, and to the Duke of York, as admiral, a tenth of the value of their prizes. But the cheating of the captains, the claims of the French governors, and the exactions of the petty port officials left very little profit for King or admiral.

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 47.

[2] *Clarendon, MSS.*, xliv. fol. 63. *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 129.

'If wee had but faire play the King's dues here would 1653
rise to something,' wrote Sir Richard Browne from Brest, in April 1653, 'butt with this most abominably shocking governor there is such an unpreventable tyranny in the upper and corruption in the under officers in this place—where we are but precario—that it is a shame to see it.'

Nor was it possible to make any appeal to the French Government.

'We were all of opinion,' wrote Hyde, 'knowinge what princes all governors are at present in France, that it would not be fitt to move the Court, which no doubt knows nothing of the arrest and restraint, nor, it may be, of the bargayne and connivance for the admissyon of our ships.'[1]

Consequently, for all the support derived from his ships, Charles might easily have starved, and the remaining resource, the charity of the Cavaliers at home, was but little more fruitful.

The exiles complained bitterly that the 'Compounders' 1652
in England were 'cursed creatures that take no thought for his (*i.e.* the King's) constant supply.' But the complaint was extremely unjust. The Compounders were poor enough themselves, and yet, out of their poverty, they contrived to spare something for their unfortunate King. In April 1652 a Mr. Barrow, who had been linen-draper to Charles I., volunteered to 'adventure his life in going over to England and soliciting some supplies for the King among persons there of ability and loyalty.' All he asked for his mission was leave to buy a horse with the first proceeds of his labours, and 'as many words in the King's hand as will give him credence with those persons to whom he shall represent his necessities.' And the one condition that he exacted was absolute secrecy. 'For if he knows that one person more is private to it, he will not venture his life, which he doth, the first step he sets on English ground.'

This expedition proved not unproductive, and some

[1] *Evelyn*, iv. pp. 270, 277.

1652 time later Barrow made a second journey to England in order to effect the sale of a barony there.[1]

Henry Seymour, who went over in September 1652 to collect certain 'good sums' promised by the Roman Catholics of Lancashire and the Presbyterians of Cheshire, was less fortunate. Some one—he himself suspected Sir Henry Wood—betrayed him to the Council of State, and on his arrival he was arrested and examined. Nothing was proved against him, and he was therefore released, but the intended collection was perforce postponed.[2]

1654 In the March of 1654 the Presbyterian ministers of London contributed 'a testimony of affection in a widdow's mite,' and from time to time small sums were sent over by other loyalists who could ill afford the tax. But these windfalls were few and far between and in the interim Charles had not credit enough to borrow twenty pistoles.[3]

1652 The state of the royal finances did not leave much margin for the supply of the King's faithful companions, and they had to live as best they could, which was usually very badly indeed. Ormonde, Hyde, and several other poor gentlemen were obliged to go into 'pension' together, paying—when they had it—one pistole a week, for one meal a day, and all were obliged to walk the streets on foot, 'which was no honourable custom in Paris.'[4]

'It is no wonder you should desire to be eased as much as may be from all kinds of charges. I am sure I have as much reason as any man living to join with you in that thrift,' wrote the Chancellor to Nicholas who had complained of his expensive correspondence. 'Yett I cannot avoid the constant expense of 7 or 8 livres the week for postage of letters, which I borrow scandalously

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliii. fol. 51. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 104.

[2] *Nicholas*, i. pp. 309, 314. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 102.

[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 67. *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. p. 129.

[4] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 174-5. *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. p. 129.

out of my friends' pockets, or else my letters must more scandalously remain still at the post house. I am sure all those that concern my private affairs would be received for ten sous a week, so that all the rest are for the King, from whom I have not received one penny since I came hither. And yet it is to no purpose to complain, though I have not been master of a crown these many months, and cold for want of clothes and fire, and owe for all the meat which I have eaten these three months, and to a poor woman that is not longer able to trust. My poor family at Antwerp—which breaks my heart—is in as sad a state, and the King as either of us, being in these very personal distresses.'[1] 1652

One difficulty was to some extent overcome by the resourcefulness of Hyde's secretary, who contrived to borrow two crowns weekly, wherewith to get the letters from the post, and to buy the pens, ink, and paper requisite for the answers to them. But the other troubles rather increased than abated as time went on, and the only person who appeared to flourish was Jermyn. He 'kept an excellent table for those who courted him, and had a coach of his own, and all accommodations incident to a most full fortune.' And this circumstance earned him more hatred from his less fortunate compatriots than any political crimes that he could have committed.[2]

From the time of his return to Paris, Hyde's letters were one long, monotonous record of want and misfortune. In June 1652 he wrote to Nicholas: 'It is not possible for you to conceive the miserable and necessitous condition we are in here; no servant having received a penny since I came hither, and what the King gets being not enough to provide him with clothes and meat.' June

In the next month matters were made worse by the flight of the English Court to St. Germains, and difficulties were increased by the necessity of getting messengers July

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 124.

[2] *Ibid.* iii. p. 120. *Clarendon History*, xiii. p. 129.

1652 to convey letters to and from Paris. This was especially important, because Charles had just opened his negotiations with the Dutch, but it was not easy to find the money required. The footmen proved to be 'not always willing to make the journey,' and Hyde was constrained to confess that 'having so little encouragement, it is no wonder that every man is willing to save his labour.'[1]

August In August the King had received forty pistoles, 'which is all the money he hath received since he came hither, and some tyme before,' asserted Hyde. 'And he hath hope to receive just such sum agayne within these few days, but alass it doth not inable his cooks and back stayres men to goe on in provydinge his dyett, but they protest they can undertake it no longer. . . . If it would give you ease I could assure you my Lord Lieutenant nor I have (not) one cardicue in the world, yett we keep up our spirits: ffor God's sake do you so too, and he will carry you through this terrible storme.'[2]

September The return to Paris in September brought no relief, and the English papers reported that 'The titular King of Scots is reduced to so low a condition that he is forced to eat his meals in taverns here in Paris, having not the commodity of dining at home.'[3]

December On the 20th of December Hyde was so cold that he could not hold a pen, but had not the three sous needful for the purchase of a faggot, and on the 11th of January 1653 he assured Sir Richard Browne:

1653 January 'We are all here in the same beggarly condition you left us, which I think, by long custom, will grow a second nature to us.'[4]

Ten days later a new trouble overtook the exiles. Sir Richard Browne's house rent had been long unpaid, and, during his absence at Brest, his landlord, growing impatient, threatened to seize his goods. The affair was more than a personal one, for Browne was the King's

[1] *Evelyn*, iv. pp. 249, 254. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 73.
[2] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 262. [3] *Ibid.* iv. p. 266, note.
[4] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 126. *Evelyn*, iv. p. 269.

Paris Resident, and it was at his house that the Anglican services were regularly held. Consequently the seizure would not be merely 'very mischievous' to Browne, but also 'very dishonourable' to the King. 'And therefore,' wrote Hyde, 'you may be confident that wee omit nothing that is in our power to doe, having not a penny to discharge the debt.'[1] 1653

By 'good words and promises' Sir Richard Foster and Lord Inchiquin prevailed upon the landlord to grant time, and in April Hyde counselled Browne to make no haste in paying the rent. 'It is a good and conscientious thing to pay off any old debts, and good husbandry to discharge those first for which interest is to be paid,' he confessed, 'but, if I were in your case, I should satisfy myself in keeping enough in my purse to preserve me a year from starving before I thought of paying any debts.' April

Starvation seemed just then no impossible fate, and in June, Hyde exclaimed in some astonishment: June

'I do not know that any man is yet dead for want of bread, which really I wonder at!' The King had not paid for his food since April, and Ormonde had not possessed five livres for months past. 'He hath fewer clothes of all sorts than you have, though I take you to be no gallant!' Hyde assured Nicholas.

The Cardinal had at last promised money, but to the infinite chagrin of the eager recipients, he was forced to reduce the sum originally named by half, at a day's notice. Yet out of that supply 500 livres were spared to Browne's landlord, with the rather incoherent promise, 'when money can be gotten, more shall.' And Charles bade Browne send some portion of his receipts at the ports 'in parte of the rente . . . with such a letter for his (the landlord's) encouragement that he may understande it to be his Majesty's money and sent by his order.'[2] July

[1] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 272.

[2] *Ibid.* iv. pp. 275, 287. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 174-5.

1653 October — The money obtained from the Cardinal was soon spent, and in October Hyde wrote to Wentworth:

'I know not what we shall do, his Majesty not having money enough to keep him twenty days, and where he will get more God knows.' Yet at the same time he instructed Wilmot to invest some of the money collected in the Empire in 'a good set of coach horses of seaven,' explaining that the King was very desirous to have Hungarian horses, 'for he is told they are the best of the world, and I am sure he hath now the worst.' A few weeks later he repeated the order, apologising for so doing with the remark: 'He (the King) speaks so often of them that I cannot but mencon them again.'[1]

November — In November a gleam of brightness came from Browne, who reported that he had met with an unexpected success in collecting the shipping dues. He therefore proposed to send to Hyde 'a hundred Lewises in gold,' which were to be privately delivered into Charles's own hands, 'towards his merry playing, wherewith to passe his time at cards this approaching Christmasse.'

Hyde complained in reply that Paris had become 'a place of prodigious expense, everything double the pryse of what it was when you left it,' but approved Browne's suggestion, and subsequently assured him that his 'unexpected present' had come, 'very seasonably' and 'most acceptably' to the King.[2]

December — Whether Charles won or lost at his 'merry playing' is not recorded, but he probably lost, for we find Hyde lamenting to Rochester in December that 'the King owes for all he has spent these three months, and in what condition his servants are you may easily conclude.'

1654 April — In the following spring both Hyde and Ormonde lacked even 'shoes and shirts.'

'By the next week we shall be wiser, though we have no hope of being richer, and poorer it is not possible for

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. p. 303, 306; xlvii. p. 46.

[2] *Evelyn*, iv. pp. 294-5, 300.

me to be,' averred the Chancellor on the 20th of April 1654. 1654

False reports of the 'splendid and expenceful way' in which the King and Queen lived, and of the 'plenty and bravery' enjoyed by their Court lent an additional pang to the suffering actually endured by the exiles in Paris. Some of the loyalists in England went so far as to assert 'that to contribute to any supply for his Majesty were but to maintain luxury,' and many of the exiles in Holland and Flanders complained bitterly of the King's neglect to supply their wants. Among those who conceived themselves thus wronged was the worthy secretary Nicholas, who had remained at the Hague. Far from sympathising with Hyde's constant assertions of poverty, he resented them as an attempt to deceive himself, and his replies were full of implied reproaches and querulous references to his own troubles.

'If you had any feeling of my necessities, or had that May
kindness for me you speak of, you would send your letters that are for the Queen of Bohemia's family under cover to Sir Charles Cotterel,[2] who may be paid for them, and not stuff your letters every week with others' epistles.' He wrote in May 1653: 'One guilder is more to me than ten to you who are there supplied, as I am credibly assured by those that know it. I pray give me leave to say so, that may starve—for ought I know—within these three months.'[3]

And vainly did Hyde send reiterated assurances that, not only he himself, but the King and the whole Court, were so far from the enjoyment of luxury that they lacked the necessaries of life, and suffered from cold, hunger, and want of clothing.

But the pressure of poverty, however severe, was not the worst of the Royalists' misfortunes. For more pernicious were the mutual jealousy, hostility, and distrust

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 147; xlviii. fol. 91. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 63.

[2] The Queen of Bohemia's steward.

[3] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. pp. 11, 14. *Clarendon MSS.*, xliii. fol. 120.

that divided the exiles, even the members of the royal family, against themselves, and it was not without some reason that Hyde exclaimed in a moment of despondency: 'Oh to be quiet and starve were no unpleasant condition to what I endure!'[1]

The King's return had brought the scattered Royalists back to Paris.

1651 December

'The old Court flies begin now to flock about him from all parts,' reported a Puritan paper. '. . . Some of them are come to the Louvre already out of Flanders, as Hyde —a man of dignity too, that calls himself the Chequer Chancellor. Here also is Bramhall of Londonderry, Dan. O'Neil, Fraser, a physitian, and one, Lloyd, a chaplain. These bring word that Buckingham and Nicholas would have come along too but that they wanted gelt. And the rest of his Majesty's blackguard and retinue that wander in the Low Countries, if they were sure of daily bread for their attendance.'[2]

The Queen, anticipating this influx of Cavaliers, had endeavoured to keep those whom she disliked—in particular Hyde and Nicholas—at a distance. To this end she had directed Long to inform the Chancellor 'that he was required to let his Majesty's servants, who were in those parts, know that it was his pleasure that none of them should repair to him at Paris until they should receive further order, since his Majesty could not yet resolve how long he should stay there.'[3]

This letter failed of its purpose, for it was forestalled by a message from Charles himself bidding the Chancellor and Secretary join him as speedily as possible. Hyde at once obeyed the summons, and arrived at Paris about Christmas time. Nicholas remained at the Hague, alleging first that he had no money, and secondly that he was too ill to travel. For this Charles expressed deep regret, and when he had accorded a 'heartily kind'

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 63.
[2] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 271, note.
[3] *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. p. 108.

welcome to Hyde himself, his first words were: 'Oh, but poor Secretary Nicholas is very sick!' 1652 January

But the Secretary's absence was in reality due, less to his illness and poverty, than to his consciousness of the Queen's enmity. To all arguments in his favour Henrietta replied, with a laugh, that he was 'very honest but loved her not,' and he was well aware that she would never pardon him for his conduct at the treaty of Breda in 1650. For this reason he had refused to follow James to Paris, and for this reason he still held aloof from the Court.

'I cannot but believe that his Majesty is well pleased that I forbore to come thither with you, being I am so very unacceptable to the Queen, and that very undeservedly, as his Majesty best knows,' he assured Hyde in January 1652.[1]

At the same time he felt deeply hurt that Charles did not insist on his coming, nor could the King's messages and apologetic letters avail to soothe his injured feelings. He had previously consulted Ormonde seriously on the subject of compounding, for the sake of his wife and children, protesting: 'Indeed, as the case now stands, I cannot conceive our starving to do his Majesty no service, can be required of me.' And he now threatened to give himself up in England, if the King could not protect an honest man from the Queen's injustice.[2] Charles had a real affection for the old secretary, and though he would not risk his mother's anger by sending him a second summons to Court, he did his best to comfort him for the neglect.

'The unsettlednesse of my condition hitherto hath kept me from sending so positively to you as I hope shortly to doe,' he told him in April 1652. 'In the meantime assure yourself I rely upon no man's fidelitie and affection more than on yours.'[3] Thus encouraged, Nicholas April

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 279, 280, 283. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 41-9.

[2] *Carte, Letters*, i. p. 423. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 3. [3] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 204.

1652 struggled on for the next two years in Holland, but suffering as he was from poverty, neglect, wounded feelings, and gout—'this devil of a disease'—he continued to take a very gloomy view of his fate. Unreasonably enough, he was inclined to blame Hyde—of whose favour with the King he was rather jealous—for all his misfortunes, though, could he have been induced to believe it, his absence from Court spared him much of the trouble and annoyance to which his colleague was subjected.

1651 November The Scottish expedition, undertaken contrary to the advice and wishes of the orthodox Cavaliers, had been the triumph of the Queen's faction and the Presbyterian party. During its progress the others had, for the most part, held sullenly aloof from public affairs, but the disaster of Worcester had dashed the hopes of their opponents and revived again their energy and influence. To them it was no disaster 'but rather a matter for rejoicing, they having wished that the King should not come in to be restored at all rather than that it should be done by the Scots, and with closing with any in England that have, at any time, been opposite to him or to his father. . . . An utter subduing and suppressing them all, Presbyterians as well as Independents, being the only thing that will content them. And that that may be done yet they noways despair, as desperately as the King's affairs do look at this time.'

On the other hand the 'Louvrians,' with Buckingham and 'all the Presbyterian gang,' were still anxious that Charles should 'walk entirely in the same steps of Presbytery as formerly, as well in the exercise of his devotions as in all his negotiations.'[1] Therefore, immediately on the King's reappearance in France the old controversies broke out afresh with increased bitterness.

'It is scarce credible how great the divisions of the Royalists are here and the heart-burnings one against

[1] *French Papers*, R.O., cxiii. N.N., 1st-11th November 1651. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 278.

another, being not so much national, the Scots agreeing well enough with the Louvrians, that party of which the Queen and Jermyn are the heads, as grounded on the difference of opinions and principles,' reported one of Thurloe's spies.[1]

In the contest for the moral possession of the King the balance was inclined in favour of the Cavaliers by Charles's own state of mind. 'A pretty discourse,' made by him to Dr. Stuart, set the mind of that worthy divine at rest regarding his former pupil's orthodoxy, and Charles not only sought his conversation, but attended diligently on his ministrations. The English Prayer-book became again 'the only rosary of his devotion,' and his chapel was 'crowded with copes, surplices, and bishops that would be.'[2]

The King, it seemed, had been restored to the Cavaliers not only in the flesh, but in the spirit, so bitter was the hatred of Scots and Presbyterians engendered in his mind by his recent experiences.

'I had rather have been hanged!' he cried, when Gaston of Orléans mentioned a rumour that he had returned to Scotland after Worcester. And he lost no opportunity of abusing the Scottish insolence, bigotry, cowardice, and treachery.

'For as for the Scots,' continued Thurloe's spy, 'he very much complaineth of them for having used him so servilely, and for having put so many indignities upon him by making him act in many and most important matters directly against his own liking, and by giving him, in a manner, no power at all till almost at the latter end, which he maketh to have been not the least cause of the miscarriage of his affairs. And then besides he doth also deeply tax them for not doing their part as soldiers . . . for he complaineth that at Worcester, where he sayeth that he had 12,000 of them, only 5000 fought as

[1] *French Correspondence*, cxiii. N.N., 1st-11th November 1651.

[2] *Mercurius Politicus*, 5th November 1651. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 37.

they ought to have done. . . . And as he cannot sufficiently commend Duke Hamilton, not only for his fidelity but also for his courage, wonderfully extolling the gallantry of his actions the day of the battle, so he greatly blameth most of the other principal commanders, and by name David Leslie and Middleton, as having shown great want of courage and conduct, and having given him no small chance of suspecting them of treachery.' The English Presbyterians were involved in the same condemnation, 'But as for those of his own party and his old friends he wants words to magnify their loyalty, and the cordiality of their affection towards him . . . and doth entirely discharge them of all blame for not having risen for him, saying that they were not at all prepared for his coming in, but kept wholly in ignorance of his state, as long as he was in Scotland, where he was not suffered to keep any correspondence or communication with them.'

And, said another account: 'He much magnifies the fidelity of the English Papists to him, above all his friends, and much vilifies the Scots, whom he is resolved never more to trouble.'[1]

All this was very disconcerting to the party of the Louvre. Even at that juncture Jermyn had not abandoned all hope from the Scots, and he was therefore very anxious to see Charles conciliate the Presbyterian interest. For this reason he urged him to attend the Huguenot Church at Charenton, and the Queen, with other motives, supported his arguments. Hitherto she had respected her dead husband's wishes, and had foreborne to tamper with her son's religion; now, despairing of his restoration by his own subjects, she believed that only a conjunction of Catholic princes could regain his kingdoms, and she was well aware that such a conjunction would never be formed in behalf of a heretic. Charles's interests, temporal and spiritual, would be best

[1] *French Papers*, cxiii. N.N., 1st-11th November 1651. *Mercurius Politicus*, 5th-15th November 1651.

served by his conversion to her own Church, and as a preliminary measure she sought to alienate him from the Church in which he had been bred. Her aim was to cut him off from the Anglican services, regularly celebrated at the house of Sir Richard Browne, and to throw him into the arms of Presbyterianism, which she knew would never obtain any hold on his mind.[1] 1651

She therefore entreated her son to moderate his language, at least in public, and so worked upon him in the matter of Charenton that he began to waver. The Huguenot ministers added their solicitations, and 'with great professions of duty besought him to do them that honour.' And Jermyn also 'still pressed it as a thing that ought, in policy and discretion, to be done,' averring that the Huguenots would be thereby drawn to Charles's service, and that the other foreign Churches would follow their lead. In November Dr. Stuart died 'in some trouble' on account of the King, whom he thus left without his best spiritual counsellor, for Charles, mindful of his father's injunctions, had always shown much 'reverence' for the Dean's judgment in religious questions. The victory of the rival party seemed almost assured when the arrival of Hyde upon the scene completely changed the face of affairs.[2]

The Chancellor, 'with equal passion,' exerted himself to prevent the concession, pointing out that the Huguenots had sympathised with the English rebels, and had constantly 'inveighed against Episcopacy.' His representations backed by Charles's natural inclination, carried the day. The King, under his influence, readily relinquished all thought of further conciliating either Huguenots or Presbyterians, and practically recurred to the orthodox Royalist policy of which Hyde was the chief guide and exponent. December

This was exactly what the Queen had feared, and for that reason she had essayed to deter the Chancellor from

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. pp. 131, 234.
[2] *Ibid.* xiii. pp. 131-2.

1651 coming to Paris. Finding her attempt vain, she received him graciously, 'when there was no remedy,' and made a last effort to win his alliance. Through the medium of Sir John Berkeley she informed him that she had a very good opinion of him, and was touched by the sight of his evident distresses. She was therefore willing to provide him with the means of bringing his family from Antwerp to Paris, 'if she might be confident of his service, and that he would always concur with her in his advice to the King.'

The incorruptible Hyde replied with assurances of his respect and duty to the Queen, but declined her offer of assistance, with the comment that 'as he was a servant and councillor to the King, so he should always consider what was good for his service, and never decline that out of any compliance whatsoever.'

In a subsequent audience of the Queen, he replied to her complaints of having 'no credit' with her son, that Charles had much 'duty and affection' for her, 'but as it would not befit for her to affect such an interest as to be thought to govern, so nothing could be more disadvantageous to the King and to his interest than that the world should believe that he was absolutely governed by his mother.'[1]

This was equivalent to a declaration of war, and earned for the Chancellor the bitter hatred of the Queen and all her following. By these, though never loved, he had been so far tolerated, but now, in face of his uncompromising attitude, and his steady opposition to 'the Queen's devices to make marriages, and traffic in religion,' their smouldering dislike flamed out into open hostility. They determined, by fair means or foul, to destroy his influence and remove him from the King, and thenceforth the Louvre politics resolved themselves into a perpetual duel between Hyde and Jermyn. Their mutual enmity 'increasing every day' produced a mutual coldness between the King and Queen, who each main-

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. pp. 108, 121, note.

tained his or her own confidant. 'And by this means,' 1652
says James, 'there arose two factions in that unfortunate Court, which were not fully reconciled till some time after his Majesty's happy restoration. . . . In the meantime it was very very difficult for the Duke (*i.e.* himself) to fashion his behaviour that he might equally perform his duty both to the King and to his mother, and this task had been much harder, had he not had the good fortune to be in the army in the year 1652 when most of this happened, so that when he came back things had already taken their bent, and no hope was left of a better understanding.'[1]

Hyde had not been, at the first, without such hopes. He had come to Paris imbued with the opinion 'that the King had, at this time, nothing to do but keep quiet, and that all his activity was to consist in carefully avoiding to do anything that might do him hurt.' He had consequently hoped that time and lack of occasion to offend might eventually restore himself and his friends to the Queen's favour, if not to her confidence, 'which they did not affect.'[2]

He soon found the hope a vain one since the circumstances still afforded Henrietta abundant ground for jealousy and resentment. In the spring she learnt that the Scots, whom she regarded as peculiarly her own, had chosen to intrust their secrets to her enemy in preference to herself. This was a slight hard to endure, and before her anger had cooled there befell an unfortunate incident which further increased her acrimony.

The Coadjutor-Archbishop, now known as the Cardinal de Retz, had long taken a keen interest in the fortunes of the Stuarts, and had more than once rendered them practical assistance. Distressed by the sight of Charles's poverty, he proposed in the autumn of 1652 to appeal to the Pope on his behalf. Charles feared at first that his friend was merely paving the way for his conversion,

[1] *Memoirs of James II.*, i. p. 274.
[2] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 140.

1652 December

and replied that his faith debarred him from the Papal sympathy. But the worldly Churchman divined his thoughts, and remarked, with a smile, 'that he had no thought of speaking of his faith,' for though it 'became him as a Cardinal to wish his Majesty a Catholic, for his soul's sake,' he was quite aware that the King would forfeit all chance of restoration by becoming one. All that he suggested was an appeal for pecuniary assistance, and 'though there would not be gotten wherewith to raise and maintain armies, there might be somewhat considerable obtained for his (the King's) more pleasant support.'

Charles accepted the overture and himself wrote a letter to the Cardinal containing certain necessary information. A few days later—the 19th of December 1652—de Retz was arrested at the Louvre, and the letter, being found in his pocket, was handed to the Queen-mother. Anne of Austria immediately showed it to her sister-in-law, Henrietta, and the two Queens laughed together over Charles's bad French. But if the Scots were Henrietta's affair, the Pope and the Catholic Princes were more so, and the discovery that Charles had intrigues with them hidden from her knowledge could not fail to incense her to the highest degree. She restored the letter to her son with fierce reproaches, imputing his undutiful conduct, as usual, to the machinations of the Chancellor.

Charles was, for once in his life, really angry. He demanded an audience of the Queen-mother, and, in his turn, poured out reproaches for her discourtesy, and for the breach of honour committed by her in showing his letter to his mother. He added much more concerning the general folly and injustice of his mother's behaviour towards him, and Anne was so far impressed that she treated her nephew thenceforth with more consideration.

Shortly after this occurrence Charles persuaded the Chancellor to attend a masque at Court, and placed him,

ANNE OF AUSTRIA, QUEEN OF FRANCE.

From the engraving by Morin in the British Museum, after the portrait by Champaigne.

with Ormonde, in the seats next to those reserved for the royal family. The Queen-mother perceived him as she entered and instantly inquired 'who that fat man was that sat by the Marquis of Ormonde?' Charles replied in audible tones 'that was the naughty man who did all the mischief and set him against his mother.' At that the Queen and Chancellor both 'blushed very much,' but those who were within hearing laughed so heartily that the Queen was constrained to laugh also, and for one night there was a truce.[1] 1652

The truce was unhappily of brief duration. The Chancellor's offences were not of a nature to be pardoned by Henrietta, and her resentment soon reached such heights that she refused to speak to him or even look at him, and spoke openly of her intention to dismiss him from her son's service. Consequently he took pains to avoid her, and though they lodged under one roof for many months he never saw her face. Naturally many of the courtiers followed the Queen's lead, and 'all who desired to ingratiate themselves to her Majesty' took care to speak evil of her enemy, 'or at least to withdraw from his conversation,' a circumstance which tended to made his position exceedingly 'uneasy and grievous.'[2] 1653

His position was rendered infinitely harder by the indolence and instability of the King's character. On Charles's return to France all had agreed in admiring the 'noble improvement of the King's person and parts,'[3] but it was soon made evident to the Chancellor that he had come back more idle and frivolous than he went. It was often a hard struggle to make him apply himself to serious matters, and Hyde was frequently blamed for neglect and delays of business for which he was not really responsible.

'I do not forget the letters the King should write,' he protested, 'but he never sets himself to that work but on April

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 66, 67.

[2] *Ibid.* xiv. p. 62.

[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 38.

1653 June Fridays, and that day hath been of late spent otherwise by chance, as it is to-day, in devotion.'

And some weeks later he reiterated his complaint: 'When anything is to be done by the King's own hand we must sometimes be content to wait, he being brought very unwillingly to that task, which vexes me exceedingly.'[1]

Worse still, from the Chancellor's point of view, was the facile and compliant disposition which made Charles a prey to any person who chose to worry him sufficiently, and caused him to appear to his friends as the tool of his mother and Jermyn.

'By truth itself, he hath more judgment and understanding, by many degrees than many who pretend to it, and that is the only thing that breaks my heart, that he makes no more use of it,' lamented Hyde.

To which Nicholas replied:

'Since God hath given his Majesty so excellent understanding and judgment in affairs, certainly God will not bless him till he make use of those great parts he hath given him.'[2]

But Charles could only be induced to exert himself by fits and starts, and his unhappy Chancellor could feel no confidence that he would have his master's support in any given crisis. Charles neither loved nor trusted Jermyn better than did his brother James, and his sympathies were all on the side of the man whom he had deliberately chosen for his guide and counsellor, but the place and the time favoured Jermyn, and the King would not 'make himself uneasy by unnecessary contestations,' or by even necessary ones.

Consequently, while Henrietta and Jermyn were said to be 'mad with the thought that they have no power,' their influence was sufficiently marked to excite the anger and distrust of their opponents. Many were the indignant remonstrances showered upon Hyde, and in

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 159, 170.
[2] *Ibid.* iii. p. 171. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 14.

reply he could only assure his correspondents that: 'All the counsel in the world cannot reform the King while he is with the Queen, and he cannot be severe or sharp in things, or to persons whom he in no degree approves.'[1]

'In a word,' he wrote to Nicholas, summing up the situation, 'the King loves both you and me, and thinks us very honest and useful servants, but he will sometimes use another, of whom he hath not so good an opinion, as well, or better, than either of us. If I did not serve the King for God's sake I would not stay here a day longer.'

In this trait of Charles's character Nicholas traced a resemblance to his father.

'The not quitting or reproving of faithless and perfidious servants was certainly an impotency that contributed to the ruin of the best of masters, our late dear master,' he wrote sadly, 'and I doubt (it) will be fatal to his family who are all subject to that feeble imperfection.'[2]

Again, Charles could deny nothing to people who were only sufficiently importunate with him; and of these there was no lack. He 'found no benefit in being stripped of all his dominions and all his powers,' but was besieged daily with suitors for honours, offices, and revenues, who asked the more boldly because there were so many chances that they might never attain what was granted to them. Charles, having nothing to give, was lavish with promises, 'which oftentimes prove more inconvenient than any present gifts could be,' and from this weakness arose endless jealousies, difficulties, and troubles. 'And whosoever succeeded not in his unreasonable desires imputed it only to the ill-nature of the Chancellor, and concluded that he alone obstructed it because they had always very gracious answers from his Majesty.'[3]

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 46, 48, 117.
[2] *Ibid.* iii. p. 170. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 283.
[3] *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. p. 146.

1652 Hyde could have wished that the odium thus incurred had been better deserved. His will to 'obstruct' was good, but his power was small, and he could put little faith in any promise made by the King to himself. In April 1652 he obtained from Charles a solemn assurance that Crofts should be denied a place in the Bedchamber, but none the less was the place granted, a few days later; and the affair, small enough in itself, was unfortunately indicative of Charles's attitude towards his advisers. 'This makes me mad and weary of my life, as not knowing hereafter how to be confident of anything,' declared the harassed Chancellor.[1]

His last solace—the knowledge that the King's grants could not be formally ratified for lack of the Great Seal, which had been lost at Worcester—was reft from him in September 1652. Wilmot was impatient to have his promised earldom confirmed to him; Herbert hoped to be made Lord-Keeper of the Seal, and the two therefore urged Charles to have a new Seal made, alleging, as a reason, the necessity of a Royal Warrant for Wilmot's embassy to the Diet. Hyde opposed this argument strenuously, pointing out that the Warrant served merely as an indemnity to the Ambassador, and was never shown in foreign Courts, where letters of credence sufficed. But he argued vainly; the Seal was made, and thenceforth there existed no effective check on anything that the Court chose to ask, or the King to grant.[2]

One comfort remained to Hyde in the firm support and steadfast friendship of Ormonde, of which the machinations of his enemies could not deprive him. 'And the Chancellor did always acknowledge that the benefit of that friendship was so great to him that without it he could not have borne the weight of that part of the King's business which was incumbent to him, nor the envy and reproach that attended the trust.'[3]

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 59. [2] *Ibid.* p. 98.
[3] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. p. 121; xiv. p. 62.

There had been some acquaintance between the two in 1652
their early youth, when Ormonde was still Lord Thurles, and later, since both had taken an active part in public affairs, their early acquaintance had been improved by correspondence. They did not, therefore, meet in Paris as strangers, and Hyde hastened to inform Nicholas that 'the Marquis of Ormonde is the same noble, excellent person you have always understood him to be, and incapable to be used to other than gallant and worthy ends.'[1] Ormonde, on his side, was not slow to appreciate the Chancellor's honesty and conscientious singleness of purpose. Their sympathies and ideals were much the same, and thenceforth the Marquis stood loyally by the Chancellor in all his difficulties and troubles. This loyalty was the more generous on Ormonde's part because he was fully aware that he must through it forfeit the favour hitherto bestowed on him by the Queen, though he was too great in sufferings, services, and rank to be subjected to the contumely cast upon his friend.

On these two, whom the King most trusted, fell the real burden of responsibility, but others were associated with them at the Council Board. Hyde was then the only sworn counsellor present in Paris, and Charles was therefore obliged to form a new Privy Council from among the Royalists at Court. The choice of Ormonde, who had so long administered the Irish affairs, could not be questioned, and equally inevitable was the choice of Jermyn, both on account of the Queen's wishes and because he transacted all business with the French Court. Wilmot had won the King's affection during their wanderings together after Worcester, and could not be left out, and these three were therefore joined with Hyde to be consulted in all public affairs.[2]

But, judicious though the selection appeared, it at once provoked jealousy and resentment, for Sir John Berkeley immediately demanded that he also should be called to

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 41.
[2] *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. p. 123.

the Privy Council. He had been, in earlier days, a friend of the Chancellor, and proportionately odious to the Queen, but since the exile he had gained Jermyn's favour and joined 'the quorum at the Louvre,' for which reason he was now warmly championed by Henrietta.[1]

Charles, however, refused to add him to the Council at her request, alleging that if he granted such an honour to Berkeley, for no reason whatever, he would be unable to refuse it to any one else. Berkeley, who believed that 'his great parts and the services he had performed . . . might well enough distinguish him from other men,' then preferred a technical claim. He declared that the late King had promised to make him Master of the Wards, and that the holder of that office had usually sat in the Council, for which reason he begged Hyde to urge his claim on the King. But in proof of his statement he could only refer to a sentence in one of the late King's letters to the Queen, which ran thus: 'As for Jack Barclay, I do not remember that I gave thee any hope of making him Master of the Wards, for Cottington had it long before thou went hence.'[2]

In face of this Hyde could not deem his friend's cause a good one, but he took some pains to explain to him that the revival of the desired office would be most unpopular in England, and would ruin many of the already embarrassed estates. Berkeley, however, refused to hear reason, and, angrily reproaching Hyde for his 'unkindness,' declared that he would himself seek 'justice' of the King. Without further ceremony he passed into the next room, where Charles sat, and, in great excitement, pressed him to redeem his father's alleged promise. At the same time he took occasion to boast of his own great services to the Crown, 'which,' says Hyde, 'he did really believe to have been very great, and by the custom of making frequent relations of

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 157, 171.
[2] *Clarendon*, *History*, xiii. p. 124, note.

his actions, grew, in very good earnest, to think he had done many things which nobody else ever heard of.' 1652

Charles knew the man well enough to believe little of his stories and less of the late King's promises; but, according to his habit, he temporised, endeavouring to satisfy the importunate suitor with fair words and soft speeches. The endeavour was vain. Berkeley refused to be turned from his purpose, and pressed his claims so roughly that Charles became irritated, and, giving him a short and sharp refusal, left the room to avoid further discussion. Berkeley, like most other people, imputed the failure of his plans to Hyde's ill-will, and thereupon informed the Chancellor that their twenty years' friendship was ended, and that they must henceforth 'live towards each other with that civility only that strangers used to do.' On this understanding they parted, and never afterwards conversed together during the years that they remained in France.[1]

Another circumstance which occurred about the same time had served to widen the breach between them. Berkeley desired to marry the widowed Lady Morton, but the lady took counsel with her old friend Hyde, who advised her not to yield to Berkeley's suit, as a thing 'both improper and very inconvenient for either of them.' But, says James, 'it was not so looked on by Sir John Berkeley, who fell out with him upon it, and heightened the breach between him and Lord Jermyn, hardly ever forgetting it, but being, on all occasions ever after, his most bitter enemy.'[2]

One of the results of Berkeley's discontent was the departure of James to the French army. This had long been the desire of the young Duke, who 'needed no spurs' to inflame his martial ardour, but had hitherto sought the consent of the King and Queen in vain. It now occurred to Berkeley that James's departure from Court would gain him a wider sphere of influence, and April

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiii. pp. 123-7.
[2] *Memoirs of James II.*, i. p. 273.

1652 remove him from the neighbourhood of those whom he conceived to be his enemies. He therefore talked ceaselessly on the subject to the Duke, implying that the person who really thwarted his desire was none other than the Chancellor. James, thus stimulated, renewed his importunities to his brother, until Charles was forced —for his own peace—to call his Council and lay the matter before it. James followed his brother's speech with a passionate repetition of his own wishes, but when he ceased to speak silence fell on the Assembly. The Queen sat without a word, and after a long pause the King called upon the Chancellor for his opinion. Hyde replied with great circumspection that it would ill become the Council to advise the heir to the Crown to join the French army as a volunteer, but that it was quite another matter to restrain the Duke when, 'out of his own princely courage,' he desired 'to attain experience in the art of war.'

This judicious speech pleased and satisfied every one. James obtained the long-sought permission to join Turenne, and set out joyfully for the French army, unregretted by the King or the Chancellor, since he took with him one element of discord in the person of Sir John Berkeley.

January In the previous January Hyde had been delivered from another enemy by the flight of Sir Robert Long from Court. Long had served Charles as Secretary since the days of his boyhood, and was regarded by his master with a kind of affection born of long habit. But he had been one of those who had most ardently advocated the Covenanters' cause at Breda, and was distrusted by Hyde and Ormonde as a tool of the Presbyterian party. For the same reason he had been approved by the Queen and Jermyn, but certain speeches made by him in Scotland had forfeited their favour. He was reported to have declared it 'impossible for any man to serve the King honestly and to preserve the good opinion of the Queen and keep the Lord Jermyn's favour.' Conse-

quently, when Edward Wogan accused him of treason in January 1652, he found himself friendless, and was simply abandoned to his fate.

Wogan, the same young officer who subsequently made the adventurous expedition to Scotland, confided first in Wilmot, and was by him induced to repeat the story to the King. He stated that in the winter of 1645-46, when he himself served with Ireton in the west, Long had held correspondence with the Parliamentary forces, and that a certain letter from him, giving detailed information of the Prince's condition, had induced Ireton to advance on Torrington instead of retiring into winter quarters, as he had intended to do. The results of that advance had been fatal to the Royal cause in the west. On being questioned, Wogan affirmed that he had himself seen the letter, signed 'Robert Long,' and that both Ireton and the bearer had assured him that the writer was Secretary to the Prince of Wales, and 'a very honest man,' in whom they placed all confidence. And he excused himself for not having laid the information earlier on the grounds that he had never seen Long with the King until within the last few days.[1]

Charles listened to Wogan's charge, and subsequently taxed Long with treachery in the presence of Hyde and Ormonde. Long, as might have been expected, repudiated the accusation, and retorted with very pertinent questions concerning the date of the supposed letter, the style of handwriting, and the persons who had seen it. He also pointed out that for the last twenty years he had invariably signed himself 'Rob.' and never 'Robert' Long.

Wogan could only answer vaguely that the date was eight or ten days after the capture of Dartmouth by the Parliament; that the hand was legible, and that the letter had been seen by Cromwell, Ireton, Fairfax, and Justice Davis.[2]

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 72. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 43. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlii. fols. 280-98. *Carte MSS.*, cxxx. fols. 244-57.

[2] *Clarendon, MSS.*, xlii. fols. 289, 298.

The case for the prosecution was certainly weak, and in Hyde's opinion the unfortunate Secretary was 'more fool than knave'; but Charles had been for some time dissatisfied with his general conduct, 'he had not the good fortune to be generally thought well of,' and Wogan was universally popular. Therefore the Secretary was sacrificed to the Queen's resentment, forbidden the Council, and ordered to resign the seals of his office. This he absolutely refused to do. His office, he said, was held under the Great Seal, and his patent as Secretary could only be terminated in a regular court of law, while a voluntary surrender would amount to a tacit confession of misdemeanour. Further, on January the 27th, he produced a detailed and able defence, dealing exhaustively with each count of the charge against him. After protesting, on his oath, that he had never written to Ireton in his life, he pointed out the difficulties to which he was subjected. The witnesses cited by Wogan were, for obvious reasons, unavailable, and Long could only attempt to show the weakness and improbability of his enemy's statements, which he proceeded to do with much clearness.

Wogan, he said, by his own showing, did not remember the date of the alleged letter, the place whence it came, nor the name of the bearer. He had himself served the Parliament while corresponding with the other side, a fact sufficient to discredit his word, and had served the King for the last four years without making any charge against the Secretary. Moreover, Wogan, as a mere boy, was most unlikely to have been selected by Ireton as his confidant, while the writer would never have signed his real name to so dangerous a document. If, therefore, such a letter ever existed, it had been probably forged by Ireton himself to induce his cavalry to move against their wishes. Finally, Long remarked that it was strange that Wogan should have confided in Wilmot rather than in Ormonde, to whom he was better known, and deduced the conclusion that the whole story had been invented

by Wilmot himself, whom he described as 'the most malitious enemy I have in the world.' This theory was coloured by the fact that Wilmot had supported Wogan for some time, paying constantly for his dinner—'a bounty he is seldom guilty of, except it be to compass some design,' averred the injured Long.[1] 1652

Upon this Wogan sent the Secretary a challenge, which said more for his courage than for his penmanship :—

'Sir,' he wrote, 'this is only to lett youe knowe that youe betrayed your truest, and that youe corespoundentt with the reabeles, and thatt youe are nott a man to be trouested. I am informed that youe are a gentleman, therefore I require you to mette me to morrow morning a foot or a hors backe wheare this gentleman shall appoynt or wheare youe shall thinke fitt, theare with your sword to justify whatt youe have said wheare youe shall finde him that shall doe the like, in doing soe you will obleg him that is as he findes you.—Yours, February

'EDW. WOGAN.'[2]

Long was no fire-eater, and he merely forwarded the challenge to the King, who would not, he said, suffer him to be 'so used.' Charles justified his confidence by arresting Wogan and sending to assure Long of his protection ; but the Secretary had, in the interval, yielded to panic and fled from Paris, leaving no address.[3]

In the next month it transpired that a trunk full of valuable papers had been left at Castle Elizabeth in Jersey, and had consequently fallen into the hands of the Parliament. This was regarded as 'a strangely supine negligence,' and Long found it necessary to write to the King in his own justification. March

'Your Majesty may be pleased to remember that upon your remove from Jersey you were to passe through all France and Flanders to Breda, and that there was but one cart in all allowed for your Majesty's robes and

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlii. fol. 307 ; xlii., 15th February 1652.
[2] *Ibid.* xlii. fol. 402.
[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlii. fol. 400. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 52.

1652 necessaries and particular trunks, in which I was permitted to carry one little trunke of papers and one box, and Sir Edward Walker another.'

In these circumstances it had seemed to the Secretary expedient to leave such papers as were not immediately required in the care of the Governor at Jersey, and it was rather through Carteret's forgetfulness than his own that they had ultimately been lost. Long's letter, however, bore no address, and though he was believed to be no further away than Rouen, he did not again trouble the Court for many months.[1]

But though the absence of Long and Berkeley afforded some relief to the much harassed Chancellor, peace and tranquillity did not reign at Court. There remained the contentious Attorney-General, Sir Edward Herbert, who 'lived by perpetual contradiction and opposition of all other men's opinions.' He cherished a particular enmity for Jermyn, and did not hesitate to declare openly 'that he would have no friendship with any who believed the other to be an honest man.' Nor did it tend to smooth matters that Jermyn had refused to speak to Herbert for years, or that he and Wilmot 'hated each other perfectly.'[2]

Scarcely less troublesome was Sir George Radcliffe, described by Nicholas as 'a very busy, meddling person, and none of the most secret or the more discreet,' much given to 'talking and making more of things mentioned to him than was contained in his letters, or was so much as thought on by the writer.'[3]

Norwich, concerning whom Hyde wrote, 'I have the same opinion I ever had of his honesty, but a much worse of his wisdom,' was in his turn jealous of the Chancellor. Equally dissatisfied was Sir Edward Walker, whose constant complaints merely wrung from Hyde the contemptuous comment, 'the man I have no esteem of

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 288.
[2] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 69. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 125, 129.
[3] *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 296.

further than Charity may lead me.' Fraser, the King's physician, confessedly 'good at his business, but otherwise the maddest fool alive,' had developed into 'a quarrelsome swordsman, very censorious and meddling in matters no way appertaining to his person or profession.' Digby held by the Chancellor as 'a good and gallant person,' was ardently hated by the Queen and Jermyn 'for pure envy,' and professed in his turn, 'no affection nor esteem' for Jermyn's ally, Sir Henry Bennett. Hatton, whose long gossiping letters to Nicholas throw much light on the state of the Court, was himself 'discontented,' and much sought after by the 'humorous,' *i.e.* the ill-humoured, and was uncompromisingly condemned by Sir Richard Browne as 'a back-biter, full of envy and malice.'[1] 1652

Not content with all this, the mischief-makers endeavoured to create further dissension by informing Lord Wentworth that the Chancellor had done him 'ill-offices' with the King. Wentworth thereupon wrote to inquire into the truth of the rumour, professing, at the same time, his faith in Hyde's honesty. 'I believe you will not deny it to me if you have done them. I expect an answer to this question, and am resolved to carry myself to you as I shall receive it. In the meantime I have no more to say but that I am, till you avow an injury done to me, your humble servant, Wentworth.'[2]

Hyde was happily able to reassure his correspondent on that point; but in the same month, May 1652, new difficulties arose with the addition of Lord Inchiquin to the Council. The Chancellor deemed him 'a gallant gentleman of good parts, great industry, and of a temper fit to struggle with affairs on all sides.' But Wilmot and Jermyn were alike furious, while a rumour that Percy was next to be sworn of the Council excited general consternation. There was indeed good cause to doubt

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 44, 53, 54, 119. *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 269-72, 290, 294. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 357.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliii. fol. 105.

Percy's discretion, if not his loyalty. He was popularly believed to have formerly betrayed the King's secrets to his brother, the Duke of Northumberland, and to his treacherous sister, Lady Carlisle, who were of the other party, and for this reason Wilmot had refused to sit on the Council with him at Oxford. Nicholas, who retained the opinion that Percy 'would betray anything to his sister,' eagerly desired some one to remind the King of his former offences. 'I am sure Prince Rupert would do it if he were with his Majesty,' he wrote to Hyde.[1]

Fortunately Rupert's intervention proved unnecessary, and the matter dropped.

The general harmony was not increased by Buckingham's arrival on the scene. He had, during the Scottish episode, earned 'a very ill-fame,' while his reckless wit and undisguised contempt for the mental powers of most of his companions made him 'good company for a time, but very uneasy to live with.' On his first arrival at Paris he behaved 'with some civility,' but it was not long before his natural insolence cropped out. Nicholas, who had loved the first Buckingham, begged Hyde to give his son a word of warning; but the Chancellor replied sarcastically that he could not 'presume' to counsel the young Duke, who had too good an opinion of himself and 'too mean a one of all others,' to be advised by any one. He also prophesied that the King and the Duke would not 'long be satisfied with one another'; and expressed the opinion that it would be better for every one else if Buckingham made his peace in England, as rumour accused him of seeking to do.[2]

With such a heterogeneous collection of people as the exiles of Paris Charles was unfit to cope; and, thanks to the 'softness of their master's nature,' they not only quarrelled among themselves, but freely criticised the

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 67. *Nicholas*, ii. pp. 18, 63.

[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 53, 63, 98. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 288; ii. p. 72.

King, mocked at the Council, and discussed public affairs with all the temerity and acrimony of ignorance.

'If the King will suffer himself, or any of his Council, to be not only openly censured, but, in a jeering way, publicly flouted by any person whatsoever, and all his Councils and actions to be made table-talk in his Court by every busybody or sycophant to please the Queen and Lord Jermyn . . . his Majesty must never expect to be quiet,' averred Nicholas.

Hyde complained with no less bitterness:

'Everybody takes himself to be a competent surveyor and censurer of all persons and actions; and every man concludes that nothing is done because he knows not what is done.'

And again, a little later, he wrote:

'The impatient itch of business and to know all things, and to be thought to be trusted, is one of the epidemical diseases of the times.'

To all the multifarious complaints showered upon him he could only reply: 'Until the King be more a King in his own house, all will not be well.'[1]

But the Louvre was unfortunately not the King's house, and so long as Charles remained beneath his mother's roof it was useless to expect any change in him. The only possible remedy was to remove him from France, and in the way of that remove stood two serious obstacles—the want of any other haven of refuge, and the want of money to make a journey, were such a haven to be found.

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 107, 109, 200. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 458. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 295.

CHAPTER XIX

The Return of Rupert—The Queen and Sir Edward Herbert—The Swordsmen—Factions at Court—The King's Illness—James and Henry of Gloucester in Paris—The Return of the French Court, December 1653—Plots against Hyde—Attempt to restore Long—Accusation of Hyde by Long—Accusation of Hyde by Herbert and Gerard—Acquittal of Hyde—General dissatisfaction with the King—Fears for his Religion—Complaints of his Indiscretion—Spies at Court—Complaints of Jermyn's Influence—Licence of the King's Life in Paris—Charles's desire to leave France—Difficulties in the Way of Departure—Charles sells the Guns of the *Swallow*—His Quarrel with Rupert—The Queen and Jermyn support Rupert—Scheme to send James to Scotland—Message sent by Seymour from England—The Cardinal assists Charles's Departure—Charles fails to be reconciled with the Queen—Departure of Herbert and Rupert—Hyde's Audience of the Queen—Charles's Departure—His Journey—Low Ebb of his Fortunes.

1653 March

IN the unfortunate condition of his affairs Charles's best hope seemed to lie in the return of his cousin Rupert, with the fabulous wealth supposed to have been won by the fleet in the West Indies. Great, therefore, was the joy and excitement when Rupert put in at Nantes in March 1653, and greater the general chagrin when the Prince's page arrived in Paris with letters from his master, giving account of his stewardship.[1]

Rupert did not deny that he had, during his twenty months' absence, taken many prizes and gained much treasure, but constant disaster had dogged his path. In the wreck of his own ship, the *Constant Reformation*,[2]

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 154.

[2] 30th September 1651.

most of his hard-won treasure had been lost, and the greater part of what remained had perished with his brother Maurice in another wreck off the Virgin Islands.[1] Of the five gallant vessels that had sailed from London in May 1651, only one—the *Swallow*—returned, leaky and wholly unseaworthy, bringing with her one English prize, taken at Guadeloupe. Both ships were too hopelessly rotten to fit for sea again, and the sale of the prize would—so the Prince stated—scarcely suffice to pay off the men, and discharge certain debts previously contracted by the fleet at Toulon.

Charles, notwithstanding his deep disappointment, welcomed his cousin cordially, and an atmosphere of expectation prevailed throughout the Court. Rupert's influence with Charles had once been very great, and each of the contending factions hoped to draw the weight of that influence to its own side. The effect of the Prince's return was first seen in the Queen's sudden change of attitude towards Sir Edward Herbert. Both she and Jermyn had long been at some pains to evince their dislike of the Attorney-General, but Herbert was Rupert's friend, and Henrietta was extremely anxious to conciliate her nephew. She therefore urged the King to confer the office of Lord-Keeper upon her late enemy, commending him as 'a wise man, of great experience, and of great interest in England.' Jermyn, for his part, 'visited and made great court' to Herbert; and the Attorney, not to be behindhand in the reconciliation, entered into 'a very fast friendship' with both his former foes.

The King, well aware that he could not resist the combined forces of his mother and cousin, hoped by yielding gracefully to keep them in good humour. Herbert was therefore made Lord-Keeper and called to the Council, whereat he was 'so wonderfully delighted,' that he remained for some time pleased with every one. All that he ever contributed to Charles's counsels, however,

[1] 14th September 1652.

1653 were objections to other men's propositions, without the suggestion of any alternative, 'which was a temper of understanding he could not well rectify, and in the present state of affairs did less mischief than it would have done in a time when anything had been to have been done.'[1]

April A severe illness, contracted by hardships, bad climates, and insufficient food, detained Rupert at Nantes, and it was not until the middle of April that he actually arrived at Court. Hyde had received a 'very kind' letter from him, and trusted that his coming would 'infuse new life'; but, though the Prince hated Jermyn and was not personally hostile to Hyde, it was hardly to be expected that he would range himself on the Chancellor's side. Besides Herbert, he had found in Paris two other old friends, Lord Gerard and Sir Marmaduke Langdale, and these three formed the nucleus of a third party which quickly gathered about the Prince. The 'swordsmen,' as Rupert's followers came to be called, were more inimical to Hyde than was their leader, and, though they held a sort of middle course, they inclined obviously to the Queen. Thus was the factious condition of the Court

May rather aggravated than ameliorated by Rupert's return, and in May Hyde wrote to Rochester:

'You have great reason to lament the divisions and animosities, which govern too much in this little Court, and which no doubt give great scandal and offence to all our friends. I wish it were as easy to cure as lament it. . . . I hope even these factions and emulations are more spoken of abroad than there is cause for, yet, no question, there is room enough for amendment, and these humours make our condition much worse than it would otherwise be.'[2]

The absence of Norwich, and of Rochester himself, made for peace, but Buckingham was still there 'at the old rate, good for nothing,' and of course a member of

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. pp. 69, 70. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 158.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 337.

Council. Langdale also had been called to the Council Board, with a view to please the Roman Catholics. He, like most of his co-religionists, distrusted Hyde, and was in return by him despised, 'as a man of weak understanding, yet proud, and much in love with his own judgment.' In July he joined Herbert in an attempt to overthrow the Chancellor, but in the following month Rupert fortunately sent him to collect ships in Zealand, and at the same time the sudden and severe illness of Charles produced a truce among his courtiers.[1] 1653 July

For some weeks all else was forgotten in anxiety for the King's life. August

'We have been very much afflicted this week with the illness of our Master, who hath kept his bed these five days with a continued burning fever, and been five times let blood,' wrote Hyde to Rochester on the 15th of August. 'This last night he hath slept very well and is now in much better tempers, so yt we hope all danger is over, but it is a very melancholy thing to have him ill.'

Dr. Fraser was in England at the time, but hastened back to Paris on hearing of Charles's condition, and the King's health improved from the time of his arrival. On the 30th of August, when James wrote to inquire after his brother, and incidentally to ask for money, 'having great need at present,' Charles was still in bed. But by the 12th of September he was sufficiently recovered to walk about his room and to be 'very cheerful' and 'pleased with company.'[2] On the 20th of that month he was seen by one of Thurloe's spies, who dined at Court with Taafe, Inchiquin, and Fraser, and evidently suffered severely from the effects of that dissipation. September

'I did as the wicked would have me, for which my head has well paid since,' he informed his employer. '. . . That night I saw their King, he is well recovered of his fever, and he is a goodly young man. God forgive

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fol. 89. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 135, 184. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 2.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fols. 155, 200, 222. *Thurloe*, i. p. 432.

1653 me, I drank to his health a dozen times that cursed night.'[1]

October But notwithstanding this favourable report, the middle of October found the King still 'very weake and not capable of much discourse,' and on October the 15th he went with Hyde, Ormonde, and some others to Chantilly 'to change the air.' He found the change not only beneficial to his health but restful to his mind; for, wrote Hyde to Rochester, 'the King is weary of Paris and of the humours of the Queen, who is not easy to be pleased.' Consequently he prolonged his absence as much as

November possible, and in November Hyde informed Browne: 'Wee are yett in the country which the King is better pleased with than with Paris, and truly he hath recovered his health most miraculously.'[2]

December The approach of winter brought the holiday to an end, and December found Charles again in Paris. Thither James had already returned, 'much growne and improved to all purposes,' and 'in extraordinary esteem with the army.' There also was the little Henry of Gloucester, who had been for so long a prisoner in England. The Parliament, finding his detention burdensome and troublesome, had sent him over to Holland in March 1653, accompanied by his tutor, Robert Lovel, and provided with the sum of £500. There he had remained with his sister Mary, until the King, yielding to Henrietta's very natural desire to see her son, rather unwillingly summoned him to Paris. Mary parted from her young brother with tears, and it was commonly rumoured that the Queen's maternal affection was really a mask for nefarious designs on the religion of the boy whom she intended to make a Cardinal. For these rumours there was, as subsequent events proved, very good ground; but Charles could not well resist his mother's request, and Henry therefore came to Paris, where he was joyfully

[1] *Thurloe*, i. p. 470.

[2] *Ibid.* i. 479, 502, 526. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fols. 293, 366. *Evelyn*, iv. p. 292.

welcomed by the mother and brothers who had so long been strangers to him.[1] 1653

In the second week of December the capital was enlivened by the return of the French Court, when masques, plays, and other gaieties became the order of the day. On the 13th-23rd of December Louis dined with his Stuart cousins at the Louvre, where they made 'a great gaudeamus.' The New Year was celebrated with the Jesuits of St. Antoine, to the wrath of an English spy, who thereupon wrote to Thurloe: 1654 January

'Upon Thursday last Charles Stuart and his fraternity went to pass away the afternoon at the Jesuits of St. Anthony's Street, and under pretence of the feast of New Year's Day he did begin to contribute to the service of idols, which discovers more and more the baseness of their hearts.'

A day or two later Louis returned his cousins' hospitality by feasting them at the Louvre, and on the 14th of January they were entertained at dinner by the Duc d'Epernon, and in the evening by Mazarin himself.[2]

While Charles was thus seeking forgetfulness of his troubles, Hyde was plunged into renewed struggles with the cabals which beset him on all sides. Some months previously he had written to Nicholas: 'I have an excellent time, and have the good fortune to be equally disliked by those who agree in nothing else.'[3] And his troubles were now increased by the arrival of Percy from Holland. In May Percy had obtained the office of Lord Chamberlain, to the disgust of many of his compatriots, and in particular of Nicholas, who declared that 'no person of honour or honesty that knows Lord Percy, or that hath heard of him, will ever meddle in anything he has to doe,' and considered it as 'no lesse than a 1653

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 115. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 5. *Thurloe*, i. p. 397. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 168.

[2] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 298. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 202. *Thurloe*, i. pp. 622, 647; ii. p. 6.

[3] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 171.

1653 August

tempting of God for the King to confide in persons so marked.'

Hyde, on his part, opposed the appointment with all his might, protesting that he 'could not have imagyned' such a thing. But when the mischief was done, and Percy came in August to take up his office, the Chancellor resolved to 'live civilly' with him: 'And lett them all do what they will, I am a humble servant to him and all his cabal!' he declared.[1]

November

His efforts for peace were, however, ill repaid; and in November Percy boasted to Culpepper that he had reconciled the King and Queen and would shortly oust Hyde from Court. Hatton bore testimony to Percy's influence, reporting that he was 'the great ruler at present,' and that he had entered into a close alliance with Fraser, 'the most furious, fiery politick and Presbyter ever I yet saw, and certainly . . . a very false person unto Marquis Ormonde and Sir Edward Hyde.'[2]

December

These two, Percy and Fraser, conspired with Hyde's Roman Catholic enemies to make a joint attack, and so, as they fondly hoped, to shake the Chancellor's credit. Their plan was to present two separate petitions simultaneously to the King. One drawn up by Balcarres, Fraser, and other Scots at Court, set forth the earnest desire and great ability of the Presbyterians to serve the King, but asserted that they were 'discouraged and hindered' from so doing by their distrust of the Chancellor, to whom they could not safely confide their projects. Wherefore 'they besought his Majesty that he (Hyde) might be removed from his counsels,' as 'an old, known and declared enemy to all their party.' The Roman Catholic petition represented that since the destruction of the Anglican party and the final overthrow of the Presbyterians at Worcester, the King's only hope lay in the Pope, the Catholic Princes, and his own

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 387; xlvi. fol. 180; xlviii. fol. 120. *Evelyn*, iv. p. 301.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 83.

Roman Catholic subjects. 'But they had great reason 1653
to fear that all these hopes would be obstructed and rendered of no use, not only by there being no person about his Majesty in whom the Catholics had any confidence, but by reason that the person most trusted by him and through whose hands all letters and despatches must pass is a known enemy to all Catholics; and therefore they besought his Majesty that that person, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, might be removed from him.'

The petitioners relied greatly on the Queen's support, but before they were ready for action one of their number, Francis Walsingham, saw fit to betray all to the King, and to furnish him with copies of the two petitions. Charles met the complication after a characteristic fashion. He showed the documents to Hyde and Ormonde, and then 'made himself very merry with the design,' chose the affair for his topic of conversation at dinner, and did not forbear his jests even in the presence of the Queen. Thus he effectually slew the plot by ridicule, and the projected petitions were never presented.

But the defeat of this plot did not bring peace to Hyde. 'Both factions continued their implacable malice towards him, nor did he find any ease or quiet by the giving over that design, one breaking out after another as long as the King remained in France.'[1]

The next scheme was an attempt to deprive Hyde of the office of Secretary, concocted by Herbert and Jermyn, supported by Rupert and Culpepper, and engineered by Henrietta. In order to effect their purpose it was only necessary to restore Long. The ex-Secretary was, therefore, recalled to Paris, and advised to petition for a declaration of acquittal, or, at least, for a fair trial. His petition was laid before the King in Council by the Queen herself. Charles read it, and, in some surprise, reminded his mother that he had originally dismissed Long at her instigation.

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. pp. 64, 65.

1653 Henrietta replied 'that she had now a better opinion of him, and that she had been misinformed.' But Charles, rather irritably, threw the petition aside as worthless, remarking that very few of his English friends would ever trust Long again.[1]

This incident brought to a point a plot which had long been brewing against the Chancellor. Ever since his own disgrace Long had been whispering abroad that Hyde was a traitor, and in support of this statement he appealed to the testimony of Massonett, an under-clerk, who had taught the King to write as a child, had followed him to Scotland, and had been captured at Worcester. In a letter, dated the 16th of May 1652, Massonett gave certain information against Hyde which he professed to have derived from a maid-servant whom he had met in London. This woman, called variously Elizabeth Hodges and Elizabeth Haughton, had formerly served Massonett's wife in Oxford; since then she had been employed in Cromwell's household, and she was said to have asserted that she had herself introduced Hyde and Edgeman, whom she knew well, into the Protector's presence at Whitehall. She added an accurate description of both their persons.[2] Armed with this
July letter Long proceeded cautiously. In July 1653 he confided to Sir Richard Grenvile, who cherished a grudge against Hyde for events long past in Cornwall, that the Chancellor was Cromwell's pensioner, and begged him to warn the King on his own responsibility, since an accusation coming from Long himself would be certainly disregarded.[3] Grenvile, glad of the
August chance to injure his enemy, wrote to the King as desired, stating that Hyde had been 'very lately' in England, and was strongly suspected of receiving a pension from Cromwell.

'Now if Hide hath done this unknown to your

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 72. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 205.
[2] *Carte MSS.*, cxxx. fol. 182.
[3] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fol. 93.

Majesty, he is and too long hath been, a mischievous traytor,' he concluded; 'some of great quality assure me he hath had long tyme a great pension paid him from England for intelligence.' And he added that Elizabeth Hodges was ready to come over from England as witness, if her expenses were paid. 1653

Ormonde, at the King's desire, wrote to demand of Grenvile the names of those persons 'of great quality' to whom he referred. To this Grenvile replied that he had first heard the report from Sir Edmund Wyndham, then at Boulogne, but had since had it confirmed by Colonel Keane at Paris, and the Bishop of Derry at Flushing. He added to his statements comments on 'the high rate' at which he considered Hyde's wife and family to live at Antwerp, which it was evident could not be supported by honest means. The next step was to demand of the Bishop and Wyndham the grounds of their accusation, which were found to be extremely small and unsatisfactory. October

The Bishop, in reply, alleged a promise of secrecy concerning his informant, which he begged he might not be compelled to break, disclaimed all enmity towards Hyde, and protested that he had never stated the accusation as a fact. November

'Only when the report was already mounted upon the wings of the wind, when many men's mouths were full of it, when Sir Richard Grenvile told me of it, and of his (Hyde's) weekly packetts at the charge of a pistole a week . . . then indeed I answered that I had been told also he had a pension, but by whom, or when, or where, or for what end, I said nothing. . . . I thanke God if my credit be doubted I can produce another witness who had the same relation, though not at the same time.'

Wyndham's evidence proved even slighter, and he asserted that he had merely observed in 'an accidental discourse upon the highway' concerning Long's disgrace, that 'if all were true that Long said, he could avenge himself.'

1653 Ormonde, therefore, wrote again to Grenvile, condemning his charge against Hyde as frivolous, and forbidding him the Court, in the King's name, 'until further pleasure.'[1]

December There the matter seemed to be ended, but this was by no means the case. Gerard next took up the cause, and denounced Hyde as a traitor in the presence of Berkeley, Taafe, and Bampfylde. Taafe promptly challenged his words, declaring himself the Chancellor's friend; but Gerard maintained his statement, and contemptuously bade the other repeat it to the King or to Hyde. Taafe retorted that he was 'no tale-bearer,' but that if he were to repeat all that had passed the rest 'would be ashamed.' This stimulated Gerard to write himself to the King, representing that Hyde had never cleared himself from the aspersions cast upon him; and Hyde, forced at last to notice 'the old, foolish scandal,' moved for an examination in Council.

1654 January The Council was called on January the 13th, 1654, and Long repeated his story about Elizabeth Haughton before it, calling Massonett as his witness. He was supported by Herbert, who had spent the previous night in formulating counts against the Chancellor; but all the evidence collected by the Lord-Keeper amounted only to 'a headless story' that 'Edmund Wyndham told Richard Grenvile, who wrote to Long, who wrote to this town, that a certain person who passed by Boulogne had heard in England that Hyde was a pensioner of Cromwell.'[2]

The absurdity of the charge was so evident that it was received with shouts of laughter; but Hyde, merely observing that there were people in the town who had seen him daily since he came from Spain, insisted on retiring while the matter was under discussion. As soon as he was gone Jermyn opened the debate with

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fols. 146, 294, 318; xlvii. fols. 11, 103. *Carte MSS.*, cxxx. fol. 184. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 19.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. pp. 34, 37. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 156.

the remark 'that he believed the Chancellor a very honest man,' but thought that there was a lesson to be learnt from the affair. It was evident 'that an honest and innocent man might be calumniated,' and on this analogy Long was probably as innocent as Hyde, and ought to be cleared and restored. Herbert then took up the parable, arguing that Hyde was neither convicted nor acquitted, and should therefore be suspended from office while Long prepared his proofs and produced his witness, Elizabeth Haughton, as he had offered to do. And Long himself declared that since he had been dismissed unheard the same measure ought, in common justice, to be dealt to his enemy.

To all this Charles answered hotly that the whole affair was 'a vaine thing . . . false and ridiculous,' and that this 'foul and foolish accusation was in itself sufficient to discredit Long for ever.' Rupert, to the chagrin of his friends, 'who were much deceived in their expectation of his support,' confirmed Charles's words, saying that 'the attempt must trench at his Majesty's person higher than at the Chancellor's, in that these men must aim to govern the King,' and therefore would fain deprive him of his most able minister. James, who always followed Rupert's lead, spoke to the same effect; and Charles finally recalled Hyde, ordered him to resume his place at the table, and declared him in higher favour than ever. He added that 'he was sorry he was not in a condition to do more justice than to declare him innocent,' and commanded Lane, who acted as Clerk of the Council, to draw up a formal declaration of the Chancellor's acquittal. A declaration was thereupon formulated to the effect that the King, having fully examined all the charges against the Chancellor in the presence of the Queen, the Dukes of York and Gloucester, Prince Rupert, the Marquis of Ormonde, Sir Edward Herbert, and the Lords Percy, Jermyn, and Inchiquin, adjudged the whole accusation 'a libell, derogatory from his own honour and justice, as

also full of malice against Mr. Chancellor. . . . And upon the matter declares that the accusation and information against the said Mr. Chancellor is a groundlesse and malitious calumny, and that he is very well satisfied of his constant integrity and fidelity in the service of his father and himselfe, and moreover he will in due tyme further examine this unworthy combination and conspiracy against him, when it shall be more in his power to punish the persons who shall appeare to be guilty of it.'[1]

This final threat was not without effect, and many years later, when the Restoration had actually put the power to punish into the King's hands, Long came to Hyde 'making great acknowledgments and asking pardon.' He confessed that the whole story had been concocted of malice intent, and that Massonett had actually endeavoured to bribe Elizabeth Haughton to come to Paris and make the charge put into her mouth. Hyde, with much generosity, accepted Long's professions of penitence, and agreed 'to make no more words of it, which Long seemed to acknowledge with great gratitude ever after.'[2]

In the meantime Herbert, though greatly disappointed by Long's failure, refused even yet to be balked of his prey. Hyde was no sooner restored to his seat than the Keeper, shifting the ground of attack, accused him of having 'aspersed the King in such a manner, and so much depraved him in point of honour that he was not fit to sit there.' Hyde, 'wonderfully surprised,' at once asked the King to call another Council on the following day, and require Herbert to there produce the proofs of his statement. To this Charles consented, and the Council being again assembled on January the 14th, Herbert requested that Gerard might be called in as his witness. Gerard was accordingly summoned, and

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fols. 263-4. *Carte MSS.*, cxxx. fols. 175, 197. *Dom. State Papers*, Interreg., lxv. fol. 28. *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 74. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 50.

[2] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 77.

being asked for his evidence, gave a long and circumstantial account of a conversation held with the Chancellor at Chantilly in the previous autumn. He related that one day the King had driven out after dinner with a large company, among whom were Hyde and himself. In course of time the King left the coach to see a dog set to partridges in a neighbouring field, and Hyde and Gerard found themselves left alone. They thereupon entered into a discussion of public affairs, during which Gerard informed Hyde that the King's ministers, and the Chancellor in particular, 'suffered in opinion' for their Sovereign's inactivity and habitual neglect of business. He therefore adjured the other to rouse the King 'to be active and to leave France, where he could not but observe that everybody was weary of him.' Hyde, in self-defence, denied his responsibility in the matter, protesting that he would be only too delighted to leave France, and laying all the blame on the King, who, he said, was 'indisposed to business and took too much delight in pleasures, and did not love to take pains.' These 'words of great malice and iniquitie' Gerard declared to be 'a great reproach and scandal upon the King.'

Hyde was 'a little out of countenance' at this narration, but he admitted that he remembered the occasion very well, and also the violence with which Gerard had denounced the King's idleness. He pointed out that his accuser had, by his own admission, begun the conversation, and averred that Gerard had protested, with passionate oaths, 'that rather than sit still in France, his Majesty ought to go to every Court in Christendom.' In particular he had declared that, instead of sending an Ambassador 'who was not fit for his business,' the King should have gone personally to the Diet, 'and solicited his own business, which would have been more effectual. And that if he could not find any other way to put himself into action, he ought to go into the Highlands of Scotland to Middleton and there try his fortune.'

Regarding his own replies the Chancellor professed himself less clear, but he observed that he was unlikely to have spoken with the freedom alleged to a man 'who was known to be none of his friend.' He would not, however, deny the words put into his mouth if Gerard would 'positively affirm' that he had spoken them, but, admitting the fact, would refer the question to the King's judgment, whether 'such words proceeded from any malice in his heart towards him.'

The Keeper then broke in hotly, asserting that the words constituted 'a high offence,' amounting to an argument to induce the King's friends to forsake him. But Charles, interrupting sharply, forbade Hyde to withdraw, as he was about to do, and confessed that the fault was entirely his own. He could well believe, he said, that Hyde had used the alleged words, 'because he had often said that, and much more, to himself,' and 'he did really believe that he was himself in fault, and did not enough delight in his business, which was not very pleasant, but he did not know that such putting himself into action, which was the common word, as the Lord Gerard advised, was like to be attended with those benefits which he was confident he wished.' Finally, he repeated his declaration of confidence in the Chancellor, and again ordered the Clerk of the Council to record it. Thus ended the last effort to shake Hyde's influence, to the immense disappointment and chagrin of the Queen, Fraser, and Herbert.

'In fine,' declared Nicholas's lively correspondent Hatton, 'the Lord-Keeper hath rendered himself very contemptible; his Majesty hath great honour; Prince Rupert hath done himself justice; the Duke of York hath much supported his Majesty's opinion; Mr. Chancellor proves—what we ever thought him, innocent; Mr. Long still out, and the King's party here well satisfied!'

Thenceforth Hyde was established more firmly than ever in the favour of his master, who showed him 'many extra graces.' 'One would think that the Chancellor had hired

those persons thus weakly to accuse him,' exclaimed the same writer, 'that he may come off with more honour, and (to) give him more credit with his Majesty.'[1]

The most important result of the absurd affair was the stimulus thereby given to Charles's departure from France. Gerard was by no means alone in the opinions he had expressed, and the long residence at Paris was ruining the King in more ways than one. In March 1653 Watson had protested that if Charles did not soon re-enter into action, 'My prayer to God must be for pardon for him and his Royal brother, whose lying quiet so long will, no question, occasion the starving of many good Christians, his loyal subjects, and, which is worse, the apostacie of many more.' 1653 March

In June of the same year the Queen 'perceiving his Majesty to be whelmed in the pleasures of Paris,' urged him to go to Scotland, which he refused to do 'by reason of the uncertainty of his affairs and the want of supplies if he should leave that place.' And in November Alderman Bunce wrote from Holland that many people there were 'unsatisfied with the King's proceedings in France, . . . conceiving that, if he stay there notwithstanding the peace treaty, he is not only lost in his reputation but in his business.' He added that many of the officers would resign their commissions if Charles did not join them in Scotland, and that both English and Dutch would contribute to aid his removal, but 'would have nothing to do with the bottomless bag in France to be shared among his Courtiers and doe him no good at all towards the recovery of his Kingdoms.'[2] June November

Charles, weary of these censures, thereupon called his Council and offered to start at once for Scotland, if it were thought desirable; but no one dared to advise it, and the question remained in abeyance, while complaints of the King's indolence, indiscretion, dissolute life, subservience to Jermyn, and disloyalty to the Anglican

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. pp. 75-7. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. pp. 39, 51.
[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 158; xlvi. fol. 8; xlvii. fol. 80.

Church poured in upon Hyde from England, Scotland, and Holland.[1]

1652 The Chancellor could not conceal from himself that many of these charges were only too true, but he conceived it no part of his duty to admit the fact.

'The truth is,' he wrote, 'that it is our parts to use our utmost endeavours to prevent the King doing anything amiss, but when it is done to make the best of it, and to be sure to do still what is our duty.'[2] And on this principle he exerted himself in the defence of his sovereign.

1653 'The King is as firm in his religion as ever his blessed father was, and you know a higher expression I cannot make!' he assured Nicholas in January 1652.

And in June of the following year he protested to another correspondent: 'Whatever reports you hear of our Master's change of religion you must be sure that nothing is more impossible, and he will as readily dy for it as his father did.'[3]

1651 But these reiterated assurances failed to carry the weight desired. The Queen's love of proselytising was but too well known, and it was no secret that some of the Court had already been 'so unhappy as to quit the principles wherein they had been educated for a strange worship in a strange land.' As early as December 1651, there were 'strange reports' abroad 'of the Papists having gained much on the King and the Duke of York,' and in May 1652 Nicholas wrote to Hatton:

1652 'I doubt indeed that the design of the Louvre is to persuade the King and the Duke of York to turn Papists, as it was formerly, when the Scots had any power, to make the King profess to be a Presbyterian.'

1653 March Charles's attempts to conciliate the Protestant Dutch met with almost as much hostile comment. In March 1653 Hopton's chaplain, Watson, declared that the policy

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 197.
[2] *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 65.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 42. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 441.

of 'trafficing' among all parties was 'a new trespass upon the Providence of God' which threatened 'to pull down a new heap of vengeance on our heads.' And he concluded with a virulent attack upon the Queen, who had retired to spend Lent in her convent at Chaliot. 1653

'If at Easter she means again to become as sharp an instrument as formerly to cut out our religion into Presbiteries and Covenants, or into ye rags of Rome, . . . let her Lent her finde a day of ressurection, nor herselfe a door out of her nunnerie, until the gate of Heaven shall be set open, to let her in for a reward due to her better workes.'[1]

The other accusations were not easier to answer than were those concerning religion. The Royalists, both English and Scottish, who found their schemes constantly revealed and forestalled, complained bitterly of the 'want of secrecy' at Court, and accused the King of talking too freely in his Bedchamber.

'It is an infinite inconvenience and disparagement to his Majesty's Counsel and affairs to have all his resolutions thus divulged and rendered the discourse of every idle pen, and of all sorts of people,' protested Nicholas; 'and, I may say it to you, while the King doth so freely discourse of all his affairs of greatest secrecy, openly in his Bedchamber, it will never be otherwise.' June July

'You do nothing but is known here in ten days,' wrote a correspondent from London in June 1653.

To these charges of indiscretion Hyde answered, truthfully enough: 'There is so great a licence of writinge under the nocon of gettinge intelligence, for which every man thinks himself qualified, that men care not what they write, so they may pretend to know much. . . . At least folly and impertinence does the same mischief that malice does.'[2]

[1] *Memoirs of Sir Stephen Fox*, p. 14. *Nicholas Papers*, i. pp. 282, 299. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 158, 463; xlvi. fol. 186.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 16. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 307. *Evelyn*, iv. p. 256.

But it was not with 'folly and impertinence' only that he had to contend. Malice abounded, and the Court swarmed with spies who contrived to keep Cromwell very well informed of all that passed in Paris.[1]

Of these traitors Bampfylde, Fitz-James, Sir John Henderson, and Birkenhead were the most notorious; but a certain Mason, and a German doctor named De Bote, proved themselves also good friends to the Commonwealth.

Fitz-James early met with a fit reward for his deeds, and was drowned as he hastened to lay information before the Protector in 1654. Henderson pursued Rochester to Ratisbon, but did not succeed in gaining from him much that was of importance. Birkenhead followed Wentworth to Denmark, and, on pretence of being the King's messenger, obtained possession of a letter written to Charles by Frederick III., which he duly delivered to the Council of State.

The others remained in Paris, where De Bote came regularly to church at Sir Richard Browne's house, and established a close friendship with the Lord-Keeper. His treachery was eventually discovered by Hyde, and he was consequently detained by his friends in England in the summer of 1653.

Several others fell under suspicion, justly or unjustly. Among these was Sir Kenelm Digby, who was said to have done Cromwell 'good offices' in Paris, but this Hyde was unwilling 'to think possible.' Nicholas went so far as to deem Massey 'an absolute creature of the rebels,' who had been suffered to escape from the Tower that he might play the spy in Holland; but in this he most certainly erred. An accusation brought against another Royalist, Harris, was better founded, though he succeeded for a time in maintaining his innocence.

'But it will be no wonder, since so many have proved knaves who were never suspected, that we have by chance

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fol. 204.

suspected one who was faultless,' protested the Chancellor.[1] 1653 December

The indolence which caused Charles to yield his own will to Jermyn's was not less censured than were his bedchamber discourses, and in December 1653 Hyde received a long remonstrance on the subject from Nicholas. 'I have heard,' wrote the Secretary, 'that not only Lord Jermyn himself but many others believe that the King hates him, and that it is which astonishes all, and discourages some good men, that, notwithstanding his Majesty's ill opinion and diffidence of Lord Jermyn, yet he is not only employed and trusted as premier minister in the management of all his Majesty's greatest and most secret affairs, but overbears his Majesty, even against his own judgment, to do some business, and to prefer many men, even against his own interest and affection. And (he) causes his Majesty, not only frequently to alter his resolutions, but even to break his promise, made without his lordship's privity, that the world may see that there is no relying on anything but what is done by Lord Jermyn and his friends' means and mediation. Of all which too many gave very many instances which, I may tell you, reflects with extreme prejudice on his Majesty's honour, courage, and conduct in affairs.'[2]

In all this there was, as the Chancellor hastened to inform his colleague, much exaggeration, but even the faithful Hyde could not boldly refute the indictment concerning the licence of Charles's life in Paris. To any young man, idle, weary, and despairing, cut off by poverty and other circumstances from the society and amusements suitable to his position, the situation must have been fraught with danger, and to a man of Charles's facile and pleasure-loving temperament it was doubly perilous. Good advice for the spending of his enforced leisure he had not lacked. Hyde and Ormonde were ever at hand 1652 May

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlv. fol. 153, 380, 398, 482; xlvi. fol. 8, 69, 108; xlvii. fol. 281. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 16. *Thurloe Papers*, ii. p. 467.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 31.

to instil moral precepts into his ears, and pious exhortations were continually showered upon him by his Presbyterian correspondents. 'You are now sett asyde from all other employments that you may engage your heart to Christ, and learn to be a Christian indeed,' wrote one of these in May 1652. '. . . Whatsoever I read and find comfortable to myne own heart I do straightway wish you to know the same. I find it most refreshing to read the Holy Scriptures, and the Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and to consider the Scriptures. . . . For an historical reading I humbly recommend Sam Clerk's *Martyrologie* and his *Marrow of Ecclesiastical History* lately set forth.'[1]

But the Confession of Faith and the Ecclesiastical History failed to appeal to Charles's imagination. Instead of devoting himself to pious meditation and improving study he sought forgetfulness in the coarse and sensual pleasures of the gay city, and plunged himself into a career of shameful vice. His fall was darkly hinted by his Royalist critics, and exultingly announced by his Puritan enemies, while the Chancellor pleaded: 'We must make the best of what we cannot help, and must always remember that Kings are of the same mould as other men, and must have the same time to be made perfect.'[2]

1653 July

But the voice of scandal refused to be silent, and there were those, even among the Royalists, who did not scruple to assert that the King had 'lost the affection of the French by his debauched course of life.' 'I am sorry for the licence men take to speak in that manner of the King. I have heard the matter before, and spoken freely enough of it to him,' lamented the Chancellor. '. . . I am confident he will outlive all those scandals, and give the world an evidence of another temper of mind.' But in another letter, addressed to the trustworthy Nicholas, he confessed candidly: It is too true and cannot be denied that the King is exceedingly fallen in

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliii. fol. 113.
[2] *Ibid.* xliii. fol. 115; xlvi. fol. 8.

reputation, which cannot be recovered but by some bold attempt. Besides, I must tell you he is so much given to pleasure that if he stay here he will be undone. Add to this that the usage of the French towards him is not to be endured.'[1]

The panacea for all these evils was, as usual, departure from France. 'God send us quickly from this place, for surely this lazy kind of life does nobody any good!' was the Chancellor's prayer.

Charles himself, no less weary of France than was 1652
France of him, was not averse to the journey. Ever since the summer of 1652, he had been 'wonderfully full' of his departure, and even confident of accomplishing it.

'I long to be gone from hence, and expect every day a good occasion to remove,' he told Middleton in November 1652. And in the following June he begged 1653
his sister to delay her journey to Spa, promising to join her there within a month or two. But the Chancellor, who desired the event even more ardently, was less sanguine.

'If I can imagine how he can get away without any money, or how he can get any, I am a Turk!' he protested.

The doubt was only too well founded, nor was the want of money the sole difficulty in the way of removal. Charles's endeavours to find a new haven of refuge were met on all sides with repulse and failure. Holland steadily withheld the eagerly sought overtures, and the Princess of Orange implored her brother not to venture thither uninvited. She was herself prohibited from receiving him, even on her own territory, and she could not indicate to him any spot where he might, 'with a little train, have leave to sit still' until events should again call him to action. For a while hopes were entertained of 'a handsome invitation' to Brandenburg, and

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvi. fol. 69; xlvii. fol. 375. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 173.

Charles sought to quicken the Elector's sense of hospitality by the gift of the George and Garter, an offering made, by poverty, less magnificent than could have been desired. 'It is a thousand pities that the King should send such a George, which cost but six pistoles . . . it goes against my heart!' lamented the Chancellor.

But the expenditure of even six pistoles proved ultimately a useless extravagance, for the expected invitation was never sent. An appeal made by Charles to his cousin, Charles Louis of the Rhine, proved equally fruitless, and in December 1653 Hyde demanded impatiently of Rochester:

'Why do you not write to the King concerning his remove and give him your advice? He desires nothing more than to be gone, and the least assurance or intimacon yt he will be welcome to any place, or at least that his repayre thither will not be unacceptable, will add wings to us.'

1654 January

Rochester could only reply that his efforts to wring some offer of hospitality from the Princes of the Empire had failed signally. But though no invitation was forthcoming, the events of January 1654 made the removal from France at last imperative. Hyde, Ormonde, and O'Neil declared resolutely that they neither could nor would serve their sovereign longer in that country. And Charles, 'wearied with these domestic vexations, as well as with the uneasiness of his entertainment and the change he every day discovered in the countenance of the Court to him, grew very impatient to leave France.'[1]

The urgent need of money to effect this end turned the King's thoughts again to his 'fleet.' Rupert had assured him from the first that the sale of the prize could not bring in more than sufficient to pay off the debts already owing at Toulon and Nantes, but Charles still cherished a hope that the fifty brass guns of the

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xliv. fol. 32, 203; xlv. fol. 387, 490; xlvii. fol. 115. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 52, 57, 73, 210, 215. *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 78. *Evelyn*, iv. p. 205. *Nicholas Papers*, i. p. 293.

Swallow might furnish him with funds enough to take him from Paris. Accordingly he wrote to the Prince, then absent at Nantes: 1654

'MY DEAREST COSEN,—If I had not thought you would have bene here before this time, I should have written oftener and fuller to you. The truth is, I do only defer the settinge down of my going from hence and resolvinge which way to goe till I speake with you. You know what I am promised to receive from the French Court for my journey; in the meane tyme, I am sure I am not only without money, but have been compelled to borrow all I have spent neare these three months, so that you may easily judge how soone 3600 pistoles will be gone, and yett I must expect no more from hence, but depend upon what you shall bring me for my ships, gunes, and my share of the prize. I long to have you here, and am interely, dearest cosen, your most affectionate cosen,

'CHARLES R.'[1]

Rupert replied encouragingly that, notwithstanding the oppressive exactions of the French admiral, De Meilleraie, he had made a good bargain with a merchant, who offered a very fair price for the cannon. But a week later came a second letter from the Prince, to the effect that his satisfactory bargain had been annulled by an order from the French Court, forbidding any one to purchase the cannon, and enjoining De Meilleraie to prevent its removal from Nantes. This arbitrary proceeding was attributed by Rupert to some claim made by Cromwell, who regarded the royal ships as the stolen property of the Commonwealth, or to some protest on the part of the merchants from whom the prize had been taken. Such was indeed the case, but though the English merchants bribed the port officials, and Cromwell gained 'fair words' from Mazarin, the astute Cardinal had seen an opportunity to make a good bargain for France, and did not intend to yield up either the guns or goods. Therefore he received Charles's remonstrances with March

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, lix. fol. 187.

1654 gracious consideration, assured him that the order against the sale was no new one, but the recognised law of France, and concluded with a promise to buy the cannon for the Crown, and to take upon himself any dispute which might subsequently arise with England.[1]

To this Charles agreed, stipulating, however, that the money should be paid directly to himself in Paris.

In the meantime Rupert, having discovered that the sale of the prize would not realise enough to settle the debts of the fleet, demanded that the King should assign half the price of the guns to that purpose. Charles returned an unhesitating refusal, and the creditors acting, as Hyde suspected, at Rupert's instigation, arrested the guns. 'God knows we have many difficulties to wrestle with, and once in every three or four days some new ones breake out upon us,' complained the Chancellor. '. . . In the beginning of the week, when we expected the money for the cannon, which is the mayne upon which he (the King) depends for his journey, the Cardinal sent him word by my Lord Jermyn that they were arrested for debt by a Dutchman, and therefore he knew not how to proceed in the bargain.'

April Sir George Carteret, being despatched to Nantes by Charles, succeeded in releasing the guns by declaring them already sold to the Cardinal. But Rupert, not to be baffled, immediately assigned them to another creditor, a French banker, Guibert Hessin, in virtue of a warrant held from the King.

Charles's only resource was appeal to the Cardinal, whose influence of course prevailed, and the guns were eventually made over to his agent. Thanks, however, 'to the wonderful narrowness of the Cardinal's nature and (to) his overgood husbandry in bargaining,' the price paid down was less than that first offered, and further 'abatements' were required in consideration of paying the sum in gold, 'fitter to be insisted on by the

[1] *Evelyn*, iv. p. 288. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 102, 104. *Clarendon, History*, xiv. 78. *Thurloe*, ii. p. 186.

meanest merchant than by a member of the Sacred College, who would be esteemed a prince of the Church.'[1] 1654

Rupert, who was more sensitive about his debts than were either the King or the Chancellor, returned to Paris in a fury. Though he had succeeded in paying off the sailors, nothing remained over wherewith to satisfy the claims of Hessin, and he again urged Charles to pay the debt out of the proceeds of the cannon. Charles refused as before, and added to his refusal a demand for an account of the money already expended by his cousin. Rupert deemed his honour impugned, and more furious than ever, presented an account written in his own hand, by which the King was clearly demonstrated to be his debtor. For the payment of this debt the Prince did not press, but he appended to his statement the following note: May

'Besides all this, I stand ingaged for your Majesty, as I have tould you. To be freed from this ingagement—which, if your Majesty do not remember, I am ready to tell or to sette down to you—is a sutte I must needs continue to make to your Majesty, whatever you may please to do for the residue of the debt before appearing due to me.'[2]

This appeal was supported by the petition of Hessin himself, who alleged that the King's officers had seized the funds assigned by the Prince for repayment of the sums expended on the fleet at Toulon in May 1651, 'au préjudice de la parole et des traités faits avec la dite Altesse, le Prince Rupert.'

But Charles, secure in the Cardinal's support, coolly repudiated the debt, and declared that he had never heard of it, nor of the funds supposed to have been appropriated by his agents.'[3]

Rupert, conceiving himself injured in point of honour,

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 71, 76, 165. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. pp. 227, 229. *Clarendon History*, xiv. 84.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlvii. fol. 209.

[3] *Ibid.* xlviii. fol. 208, 209.

1654 made his discontent 'very visible,' and a violent quarrel ensued between the cousins, in which the Queen and Jermyn espoused Rupert's cause.[1]

March The friendship between Rupert, Jermyn, and Herbert had arrived, by that time, 'at a very great perfection,' and the outcome of the alliance was a project to send James to Scotland under the tutelage of the Prince, his cousin. Rupert's friends had long been agitating to send him to the Highlands, but he deemed it necessary for one of the royal brothers also to join Middleton, and, naturally enough, his choice fell upon James, whose reputation and energy improved daily, while Charles sank ever lower in indolence and vice. The Queen, long since reconciled with her second son, and justly proud of his military prowess, lent a vehement support to the scheme.

'She would have the son she hath most power over in the head of an army, while the other passeth his time on this side with ignominy,' asserted one of Thurloe's spies.[2]

But it remained to reckon with Charles, and to him such a project by no means commended itself. During the past two years he had been continually galled by seeing James caressed and flattered at the French Court, while he himself was systematically slighted.

Now all his slumbering jealousy of his brother flashed out, and he answered the Queen's proposal curtly, 'that if it was fit for his brother to go to Scotland, much fitter for him. But since she thought it convenient for his brother, he should go with him.'

Henrietta pleaded that 'it was not wisdom to hazard both,' but Charles retorted, 'it was wiser and more generous (for James) to hazard his life there, than in the wars of France, in which he was not concerned.' There the discussion ended, and a few days later the King

[1] *Clarendon State Papers*, 10th, 17th April 1654, iii. p. 232.
[2] *Ibid.* iii. p. 207. *Thurloe State Papers*, ii. p. 179.

announced his intention of moving quietly to some place whence he might depart secretly to Scotland.[1] 1654

This course of action had been rendered possible by the promises of assistance made by the Emperor and German Princes. April

'For, lett me tell you,' wrote Hyde to Wentworth, 'we had not before evidence enough to assure us that the King would not want breade in three months after he left France.'[2]

The German promises were supplemented by the gift of £2500 from the Loyalists at home, who observed with dismay the steady rapprochement between the Protector and the Cardinal. In a panic lest their sovereign should be surrendered to his enemies, they sent over Henry Seymour, with what money they could collect, charging him 'to be very importunate with the King that he would remove out of France.' They added an assurance that the poor and persecuted English Loyalists would not fail to contribute to Charles's support if he complied with this request. If he chose, however, to remain in France, 'no body could be prevailed with to send him anything.' May

Seymour's errand was executed with the greatest secrecy, and he himself spoke to no one but the King, the Chancellor, and Ormonde. Yet, 'by some one's curiosity' his presence in Paris was discovered, Jermyn and Herbert spoke openly of his visit, and, on his return to England, he was arrested as 'the man who lately came over, and held secret conference with the King in Ormonde's room.' He insisted on being brought before Cromwell, who surprised him with an accurate description of the rooms he had entered in Paris, and with details of his conversation with Charles. In the face of such evidence, it was useless to deny the facts, but the Protector showed mercy, and Seymour ultimately escaped with his life.[3] June

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 128. [2] *Ibid.* xlviii. fol. 140, 141, 143.

[3] *Ibid.* xlvii. fol. 228; xlviii. fols. 234, 235. *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. p. 241. *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 82. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. p. 100.

1654 May

Charles was very willing to comply with the request of his subjects, but though the money sent by them enabled him to redeem his own seal and his brother's George and Garter from pawn, it did not suffice to discharge his debts in France, or to defray the expenses of his journey thence. It was necessary to make another appeal to Mazarin, and this time the appeal was not made in vain. The Cardinal, having at last decided on his English policy, was anxious to be rid of the English King, and genuinely ready to facilitate his departure. He therefore assured to Charles the regular continuance of his monthly pension, an advance of the sum due for the next six months, and the payment of all arrears in full, or at least the satisfaction of the King's French creditors; and as earnest of his good intentions, he paid down 3000 pistoles towards the price of the cannon, promising to hand over the balance so soon as the weight of the brass had been accurately ascertained. Charles, in return, engaged himself to leave the country within ten day of receiving his money, and on the 29th of May he took a formal leave of the French Court.[1]

Rumour said that the parting of the exiles was to be prefaced by a general reconciliation, and at the end of May Hyde wrote to Rochester:

'I heare there will, before our parting, be such a reconciliation of all misunderstandings here that the intelligence will hereafter be better pursued, and we shall live without those scandalous reproaches that make our enemies myrth, and our friends ashamed of us.'

But the Queen demanded, as a first condition, an acknowledgment of error on the part of her son, and this Charles could not bring himself to concede. He had, he assured Jermyn, always desired 'a good understanding' with his mother.

'But,' he continued, 'to acknowledge that I have used her ill, as you say shee sayes I have, I cannot thinke to be the way, because I cannot accuse myself of it. . . . Not

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 165.

that I am so confident of my owne carefulness, but that I believe I may have run into errors, but I am sure they were unwilling ones, and, as such, shall be most willingly acknowledged when I am convinced of them. But, of this sort, I cannot acknowledge having concealed from her some particulars of my business to be, nor can I promise to follow any advice she shall give me for the disposall of myself and conduct of my affairs.' The concession of this last demand would, he said, 'ascribe too much infallibility to a mortal person,' and he concluded with a protest that his mother's 'misconstructions' should never 'lessen' his duty and affection for her.[1] 1654

On the 31st of May Henrietta made a personal effort to convince her son of the error of his ways, but the discussion speedily became altercation and produced no good result. Night and morning the two were engaged in 'hot disputes' concerning Rupert, Herbert, and Berkeley; but Charles's obstinacy had been thoroughly roused, nothing that his mother could say availed to make the slightest impression, and on the following day she set out with her two younger sons, still unsatisfied, for Rheims, in order to attend the coronation of her nephew, the King of France. June

'For though in appearance he is gentle, familiar, and easy, yet he will not be purmanded (*sic*) nor governed by violent humours, such as these are,' explained an observant spy.[2]

Henrietta's departure was immediately followed by that of Herbert, who, finding that Charles had omitted his name from the list of those chosen to accompany him, resigned the Great Seal, quitted the Palace, and took lodgings in the town.[3]

A few days later Rupert also bade farewell to the King, announcing his intention of looking to his own affairs at Heidelberg and Vienna. With evident design

[1] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 173, 226.
[2] *Thurloe*, ii. p. 312.
[3] *Clarendon*, *History*, xiv. p. 91.

1654 to mark the finality of his action, he added, carelessly, that Charles might dispose of his place as Master of the Horse whenever he thought fit; a permission received by the King as indifferently as it was given. On the next day, June 6th, Rupert 'set forward for his own country'—that country on which his eyes had never yet looked—'with a very great train, and brave,' consisting of thirty Cavaliers and several led horses.[1]

Charles's own departure was fixed for the 10th of July, and at the end of June the Queen returned to Paris in order to accompany him to a farewell 'collation' at which he was 'most gallantly' entertained by the Duchesse d'Aiguillon.'[2]

July At his earnest entreaty Henrietta consented to grant a parting audience to the Chancellor, who was accordingly led into her presence by Percy on the afternoon of the 9th of July. She was alone in the private gallery of the Palais Royal, and when Percy had withdrawn to the farther end, Hyde modestly requested her to give him an opportunity of vindicating himself by stating the grounds of her displeasure against him. The Queen made answer, in an agitated voice, that it would be useless to mention any particular offence, since the Chancellor's 'disrespect' towards her was 'notorious.' Moreover 'all men took notice that he never came where she was, though he lodged under her roof . . . and she thought she had not seen him in six months before, which she looked upon as so high an affront that only her respect towards the King prevailed with her to endure it.'

Hyde replied at some length, maintaining that the Queen had named not his fault but its penalty. He protested that he no longer presumed to present himself before her, because her displeasure was so marked when he entered a room that no one dared to speak to him in her presence, and he again begged to be accused in order that he might clear himself.

[1] *Clarendon*, *History*, xiv. 90. *Thurloe*, ii. pp. 237, 348.
[2] *Thurloe*, ii. p. 386.

RUPERT, PRINCE PALATINE OF THE RHINE.

From the engraving by Faithorne in the British Museum, after a portrait by Dobson.

Henrietta then burst out with the old charge of attempting to undermine her influence with the King, speaking 'with her former passion,' and concluding with the remark that she 'would be glad to see reason to change her opinion.' So saying, she extended her hand 'carelessly' for the Chancellor to kiss, and withdrew, without more words, to her private room.[1]

On the next day Charles took leave of his mother and set forth on the journey from France. It was observed as significant of the lowness of his fortunes that he travelled on horseback, being obliged to put his coach-horses into 'a light cart' for the conveyance of his clothes and bedding.[2] The first night was spent with the Duchesse de Châtillon at Merlou, and on the next day Charles proceeded to Péronne, where he inspected the French army, and bade farewell to his brother James and their good friend Turenne.[3]

On the 14th of July he reached Flemish territory, and found, to his chagrin, the gates of Cambrai closed against him. Though he held the Archduke's pass, he was 'compelled to stay long in the afternoon before they were opened to receive him,' but the apparent incivility was subsequently excused on account of the alarm caused by the proximity of the French forces. Charles's assurance that he had recently seen Turenne, and was confident that he had no immediate design on the city, considerably raised the spirits of the garrison. The governor pressed his hospitality on the King, lodged him in his own house, and entertained him at supper, but the Archduke, five leagues away with the army, steadily ignored the presence of the royal guest. 'So great a terror possessed the hearts of the Spaniards, lest their showing any respect to the King in his passage through their country should incense Cromwell against them, whose friendship they yet seemed to have hope of.'[4]

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. pp. 93, 94.
[2] *Clarendon, MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 165. *Clarendon History*, xiv. p. 91.
[3] *Thurloe*, ii. p. 436. *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 311.
[4] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 98.

At Mons, which was reached on the 16th of July, Charles was delayed by messengers from England, who came to propose a new Royalist insurrection. Their advent brought a new gleam of hope, but while Charles expressed his readiness to accept their scheme, he added a warning against any 'desperate or unreasonable attempt.' He protested that destruction must inevitably attend any rash insurrection against the Protector's army, and declared his own intention 'to sit still in such a convenient place as he should find willing to receive him,' patiently awaiting 'God's own time' for renewed action.[1]

On the 18th he proceeded to Namur, and thence by water to Liège, and on the following day he joined his sister Mary at Spa.

Thus closed what may be regarded as the first, and since things are estimated by comparison, as the most prosperous period of the first Stuart exile. So far Charles had enjoyed at least the nominal protection of France, and had resided in the country of a nominally friendly sovereign, while he had always before him some hope of recovery, and some party in arms for him in England, Scotland, or Ireland.

Now all was changed. France had entered into a formal treaty with England, and no longer recognising Charles as a reigning sovereign, bought his absence from her territory with a secret dole. Spain had not yet broken with the English Protector, and continued to ignore the existence of the English King. Holland had bound, not only herself, but the King's own sister to refuse him aid or hospitality.

Neither the Emperor nor any of the Princes would take the exile formally under their protection, and they confined the expression of their goodwill to words, or to a gift of money, such as they might, in charity, have offered to any other beggar. Not a single sovereign prince was willing to receive the English King, and in his own lands there was no longer any party in arms that

[1] *Clarendon, History*, xiv. p. 101.

he might join. In Ireland a few irreconcilables lingered in the woods and bogs. In Scotland the last rising had failed, though as yet Charles knew it not.

The wisest message that he could send to his friends in England was an injunction to 'live quietly' and await 'God's time' with patience. His adherents, both at home and abroad, were oppressed with poverty and suffered every kind of want. The faithful band that clung to him in exile was so torn by faction and dissension that there were, as the spies exultantly asserted, 'not three in all that Council together, not even in common charity.'[1]

The King himself was jealous of his brother and estranged from his mother, and he had parted in anger from the cousin who had once been his best friend.

Worse than all he had sacrificed his own honour, conscience and self-respect, and sacrificed them in vain. Yet though vain, the sacrifice had been made and there was no turning back, no place for repentance. The promising boy, on whom so many high hopes had been built, had become a reckless, dissolute man who could with difficulty be roused from his habitual indifference to perform the duties required of him. Already the confidence of many had gone from him, and their eyes turned longingly to the younger brother, full of life, and energy, and hopefulness, whose word no one ever doubted, and who showed no signs of the elder's vices. Even the hearts of those loyal men, whose loyalty Charles himself could never kill, were sick within them, while they strove to lead their master in the right path, or to shield him when he swerved from it. And well indeed might Hyde write to Taylor:

'The King is now as low as to human understanding he can be.'[2]

[1] *Thurloe*, ii. p. 275.

[2] *Clarendon MSS.*, xlviii. fol. 315.

INDEX

A

Abbots Leigh, King at, 246-249.
Aberdeen, visit of King to, 163, 175, 199.
—— money presented to King, 163, 175.
Act of Classes, 61, 96.
—— repealed, 199.
Act of Confiscation, 205, 413.
—— Oblivion, 413.
Agen, victory of Condé at, 346.
Aiguillon, Duchesse d', 341, 492.
Airlie, Earl of (James Ogilvy), 186, 189.
Alexis, the Czar, 285.
Alford, Captain, 254.
Andrews, Anne, 223, 241.
Andrews, Eusebius, execution of, 203.
Anglicans in Paris, 321-323.
Annandale, Earl of, 164.
Anne of Austria, Queen-Regent of France, 9, 19, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 76, 104, 108, 109, 289, 339.
—— description of, 19.
—— love of, for Buckingham, 107.
—— appeal of Charles I. to, 71.
—— kindness of, to Stuarts, 18, 118, 328, 344.
—— dresses Mademoiselle for ball, 31-33.
—— reproaches Mademoiselle, 35.
—— cold towards Mademoiselle, 35.
—— supports Charles's suit for Mademoiselle, 105, 107, 108, 340, 341.
—— rallies Mademoiselle, 107.
—— protests against Montrose's execution, 154.
—— suppresses Anglican Chapel, 321.
—— loyalty of Henrietta to, 328.
—— arrests Condé, 329.
—— forced to release Condé, 331.
—— a prisoner in the Palace, 331.
—— courage and ability of, 331, 332, 345, 346.
—— frustrates Condé, 331, 332, 345, 346.
—— forbids marriage of Mlle. de Longueville, 336.
—— reply of, to Mme. Châtillon, 344.
—— thanks Charles for services, 358.
—— Charles and Henrietta remonstrate with, 359.
—— shows letter of Charles to Henrietta, 446.
Anne of Austria at a masque, 447.
—— maid of honour of, 34.
Anti-Scotists, 55, 64.
Antrim, Marquis of (Randal Macdonnel), clings to clerical party, 68.
—— arrest of, 203.
Appleby, skirmish at, 206.
Antwerp, family of Hyde at, 293, 323, 433, 444, 471.
—— King at, 104.
Argyle, Marquis of (Archibald Campbell), 81, 87, 91, 94, 123, 125, 126, 127, 133, 134, 135, 136, 139, 141, 145, 146, 147, 148, 153, 162, 174, 185, 187, 188, 193, 195, 199, 219, 391, 396, 399, 406.
—— adheres to clericals, 41, 68.
—— submits to Cromwell, 61, 390.
—— calls new Parliament, 61.
—— procures Act of Classes, 61.
—— power of, 62, 80, 165.
—— relations of, with Lauderdale, 62, 96.
—— sends commissioners to the King, 128.
—— beguiles King with false promises, 132, 139,
—— promises security for Montrose, 139.
—— vengeance of, on Montrose, 149-152, 168.
—— his interpretation of the King's message, 154, 155.
—— Charles's distrust of, 157, 168, 398.
—— duplicity of, 166-169.
—— attempts to conciliate King, 166-169.
—— abilities of, 166.
—— policy of, 166-168.
—— proposes marriage with his daughter to King, 139, 168, 197.
—— induces King to sign Declaration, 177, 178.
—— willing to restore Engagers, 186.
—— Charles's promises to, 186, 196.
—— alliance of, with Buckingham, 187.
—— hatred of, for Hamilton, 96, 196.
—— power of, shaken, 196, 200.
—— invites Jermyn to Scotland, 197.
—— messages of, to Queen, 197.
—— opposes march to England, 202.
—— retires to Highlands, 202.
—— quarrels with Lorne, 398.
—— reconciled with Lorne, 403.
—— excused to King by Lorne, 403.

Argyle, Marquis of (Archibald Campbell), sons of, 166, 390, 398.
—— daughter of, 139, 166, 168, 197.
—— house of, 96.
—— vassals of, 390, 402.
—— agent of, 83, 139, 145.
—— creatures of, 167.
Armorer, Nicholas, 46, 422.
—— sent to England, 420.
—— Sir William, 89.
Arundels, 132, 171.
Ascham, Anthony, goes as English envoy to Madrid, 290.
—— murder of, 290, 422.
—— secretary of, 290, 292.
—— interpreter of, 290.
—— servant of, 290.
Ashburnham, John, 13, 15, 422.
Assynt, Neil Macleod of, betrays Montrose, 148.
Astley, Jacob, Lord, speech of, 414.
Athol in arms for King, 191.
—— men of, 187.
—— Earl of (John Murray), 186, 192, 199, 398, 407, 409, 410.
Aubigny, Lord (George Stuart), 89.
—— widow of, 89, 90.
—— Lady (Katharine Howard), 89, 90.
Augustines, French Vicar-General of, 374.
Austria, 366.
—— house of, 21.
—— Mademoiselle desired as Empress of, 33.

B

Bagot, Colonel, 248.
Bagshall, Mr., 275.
Baillie, Robert, a commissioner of the Kirk, 91.
—— his opinion of the King, 92.
Balcarres, Earl of (Alexander Lindsay), 189, 199, 398.
—— esteems Bampfylde, 396, 397.
—— warned against Bampfylde, 396, 397.
—— takes arms for King, 398.
—— intrigues against Glencairn, 403-406.
—— secession of, 403, 405, 406.
—— comes to France, 406.
—— intrigues against Hyde, 468.
—— agent of, 391.
Balfour, Sir James, 154, 189.
Bampfylde, Charles, 63, 65, 472, 480.
—— aids James to escape, 43-46.
—— discontented, 47.
—— intrigues of, 47.
—— disgrace of, 174.
—— betrothed to Anne Murray, 174.
—— wins confidence of Highland Chiefs, 395-396.
—— sent to the King by Chiefs, 396.
—— Chiefs warned against, 396.
Bampfylde, Charles, King orders arrest of, 397.
—— comes to Paris, 397.
—— discountenanced by King, 397.
—— favoured by Jermyn and Balcarres, 397.
—— asserts King's complicity in murder plot, 425.
—— character of, 43, 47, 395-396.
—— treachery of, 396, 397, 421, 422, 425, 426.
Barbadoes, prisoners sent as slaves to, 60.
Barlow, Mrs. (Lucy Walter), mistress of Charles II., 70.
—— son of, 70.
Barrow, Mr., collects money for King, 431, 432.
Batten, Sir William, 43, 52, 57, 58, 64, 65.
—— joins King, 52.
Bavaria, Ferdinand, Elector of, 369.
Beauchamp, Lord (Henry Seymour), 171, 172, 204, 421.
Beaufort, François, Duc de, 20, 21, 75, 328, 330, 339, 351, 352.
—— commands army of Fronde, 346.
—— quarrels with Nemours, 347.
—— animus of, against Charles II., 353.
—— excites riot, 354.
—— helps to quell riot, 355.
—— flies from Paris, 357.
Bedchamber men, 92.
Bellamont, Lord (Henry Bard), 285.
Bellasys, John, Lord, 171, 420.
Bellenden, Sir William, 387.
Bellièvre, Pomponne de, 38, 39.
Bellings, Richard, 368, 370.
—— letters of, 373, 374.
Benbow, Captain John, 218.
Bennett, Henry, secretary of James of York, 313, 314.
—— friend of Jermyn, 459.
Bentley Hall, 235, 236, 240, 242, 243, 244, 249.
Berkeley, Sir John, 47, 63, 126, 131, 254, 444, 458, 472, 491.
—— ambition of, 452, 453.
—— renounces Hyde's friendship, 453, 454.
—— desires to marry Lady Morton, 453.
—— goes with James of York to French army, 454.
—— letters of, 124, 135.
Berkshire, Earl of (Thomas, Lord Howard of Charlton), 8, 15.
Berwick, 42, 55.
—— Cromwell musters at, 169.
Birkenhead, Isaac, 203, 204.
—— John, 480.
Bishop, George, 203.
Blague, Colonel Thomas, 224.
Blake, Admiral Robert, 117, 265, 292, 293, 376.

Blake, Admiral Robert, attacks French fleet, 359, 377.
Bleneau, victory of Condé at, 347.
Bog of Gicht, 162, 163.
Bordeaux, Antoine de, French Resident in England, 359.
—— French Ambassador in England, 388.
Borell, Sir William, Dutch Ambassador at Paris, friendship of, for Charles II., 376, 385.
—— negotiations of, with Charles II., 377, 378, 380, 434.
—— offended by Princess of Orange, 385, 386.
—— son of, 384, 385, 386.
Boscobel, 210, 222, 223, 224, 225, 229, 236.
—— King at, 231-234.
—— search for King at, 240, 241.
Boswell, Sir William, 71.
Bouillon, Duc de (Frederic de la Tour), 75.
Bourbons, character of, 6.
Bourg, Condé admits Spaniards to, 345.
Boynton, Captain, 190.
Bramhall, Dr. John (Bishop of Londonderry), 92, 156, 417, 438, 471.
Brandenburg, Frederick William, Elector of, friendly to Charles II., 363, 369.
—— Charles hopes invitation from, 483.
—— Garter sent to, 484.
Brechin, Bishop of (Walter Whitford), 97.
—— son of, 97.
Breda, 79, 104, 127, 139.
—— treaty of, 128, 131, 134-144, 145, 146, 157, 200, 204, 295, 298.
Brentford, Earl of (Patrick Ruthven), 16, 54, 79, 122, 163, 165.
Brewood Forest, 223.
Bridport, King's adventures at, 258, 260-261.
Brighton, ship secured for King at, 271.
—— King at, 275-276.
Bristol, 7, 243, 246.
—— Earl of (John Digby), 11, 49, 112.
Broadwindsor, King's adventures at, 262, 263.
Brodie, Alexander (of Brodie), 91, 134, 158.
Bromsgrove, King's adventure at, 244.
Broughton, Major, trooper of, 247.
Brown, Anthony, house of, 271.
Brown, Sir John, 201.
Browne, Geoffrey, sent to treat at Brussels, 306.
—— makes unauthorised treaty with Lorraine, 307-308.
Browne, Sir Richard, English Resident at Paris, 321, 377, 431, 434-436, 443, 459, 480.
—— house of, 321, 434-435.
—— poverty of, 434-435.
—— collects King's shipping dues, 431, 435, 436.
—— letter to, 466.
Bruce, Robert, 399.
Brussels, 104.
—— Charles's Ambassadors at, 286.
—— English Resident at, 364.
—— flight of James to, 312-315.
—— Embassy sent to, 365.
Buchan, Lord, 189, 190.
Buckingham, First Duke of (George Villiers), 187, 460.
—— Second Duke of (George Villiers), 54, 137, 140, 165, 191, 196, 214, 216, 222, 238, 328, 371, 438, 440, 464.
—— part of, in second Civil War, 59, 187.
—— to be General of Eastern Counties, 171.
—— treachery of, 187, 188.
—— character of, 187, 188, 460.
—— dissuades King from the Start, 188-189.
—— desires to be Commander-in-Chief, 207.
—— escape of, 217.
—— friendship of, with Lilburne, 417-418.
—— at Paris, 460, 464.
—— brother of, 59, 187.
Bunce, James (Alderman of London), 172, 477.
—— letters of, 379, 477.
Burly, Lord, 174.
Burnet, Bishop, 406.
Butler of Commer, 260.
Byron, John, Lord, 47, 80, 82, 83, 120, 121, 126, 127.
—— deprecates King's inaction, 121.
—— favours treaty with Scots, 126.
—— Governor of James of York, 47, 312.
—— James rejects authority of, 313, 314.
—— letters of, 83, 121.

C

CAEN, English exiles at, 23, 49, 118, 129.
Caithness, Montrose in, 147.
Callaghan, Dr., 374, 375.
Callander, Earl of (James Livingstone), 42, 60, 83.
Cambrai, 104.
—— King at, 493.
Campbell, Lady Anne, 139, 166, 197.
Cantecroix, Eugene, Comte de, 301.
—— Beatrix, Comtesse de, 301.
Capponi, Cardinal, 294, 295.
Capel, Arthur, Lord, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 80.
Cardenas, Alonso de (Spanish Ambassador in London), 293, 294, 359.
Carisbrooke Castle, 41.
Carlisle, 42, 202, 206.
—— Countess of (Lucy Percy), 42, 53, 63, 460.
Carlos, Colonel William, 215, 231, 232, 233, 236, 282.

Carteret, Sir George, 23, 118, 120, 458, 486.
—— wife of, 15.
Cassilis, Earl of (John Kennedy), 91, 134, 136, 141, 156, 158, 164, 165, 193.
Castle Cary, 250.
Castle Elizabeth, 120, 457.
Castlehaven, Earl of (James Touchet), 298.
Cavaliers, 1, 4, 5, 24, 43, 60, 93, 138, 141, 163, 171, 172, 173, 176, 177, 199, 209, 215, 414, 421, 440-443.
—— cooled towards King, 142, 143, 173, 413, 421.
—— poverty and disabilities of, 133, 172, 205, 431.
—— dismissed from Scottish army, 176, 177.
—— murder Ascham, 290, 291.
—— desire assassination of Cromwell, 422-423.
Charenton, Huguenot Church at, 379, 380, 442, 443.
Charles I. of England, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 24, 26, 38, 39, 40, 41, 47, 52, 53, 56, 64, 89, 93, 99, 102, 113, 114, 115, 125, 135, 139, 143, 153, 161, 177, 178, 179, 321, 370, 376, 395, 449, 451, 452.
—— remorse of, 17, 40.
—— treats with Army, Parliament, and City, 40.
—— treats with Scots, 40-41.
—— anxious for James's escape, 43-44.
—— desires Hyde to attend Prince of Wales, 48.
—— sends Glamorgan to Ireland, 67.
—— entrusts Ireland to Queen, 67.
—— Queen desires to join, 69.
—— trial and death of, 70-72.
—— devotion of Montrose to, 85, 153.
—— saying of, 1.
—— letters of, 14, 39.
—— adopted children of, 187.
—— servant of, 276.
Charles II. of England as Prince of Wales, 7-11, 14-16, 22-28, 30-37, 40-42, 48-58, 60-73.
—— deemed unsafe in Jersey, 8.
—— summoned to France by Queen, 9.
—— councillors averse to removal of, 9-11, 14-16.
—— scheme to take to Ireland, 11, 12.
—— plot to betray, 13.
—— goes to France, 16.
—— position of, in France, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 35, 36.
—— gaieties of, 26, 27, 28, 31.
—— courts Mlle. de Montpensier, 28, 30, 31, 33.
—— neglects Mlle. de Montpensier, 34.
—— admires Mme. de Châtillon, 34.
—— desires to join French army, 37.
—— injunctions of Charles I. to, 40.
Charles II. of England as Prince of Wales, proposal to crown, 40.
—— invited to Scotland, 41, 42.
—— reply of, to Scots, 42, 51.
—— goes to Holland, 43, 49.
—— summons councillors to join him, 49.
—— takes command of fleet, 50.
—— with fleet in Channel, 50-57.
—— attempts to conciliate city, 52, 53, 63, 276.
—— receives Scottish envoy, 54.
—— returns to Holland, 58.
—— reception of, by States-General, 58.
—— remains as guest of Prince of Orange, 58.
—— joined by councillors, 61.
—— hears of Royalist defeat, 61.
—— declines to go to Scotland, 62.
—— condition of, at the Hague, 63-65.
—— illness of, 65.
—— appoints Rupert Admiral of fleet, 66.
—— plans to go to Ireland, 68.
—— spends Christmas at the Hague, 69.
—— admires Princess Sophie, 69.
—— liaison of, with Lucy Walter, 70.
—— owns her son, 70.
—— attempts to save the King's life, 70-72.
—— commands of King to, 72.
—— hears of King's death, 72.
—— receives condolences, 73.
—— letter of, to Hamilton, 51.
—— letters to, 9, 13, 40.
—— council of, 13, 46.
—— secretary of, 49, 454, 455.
—— chaplains of, 16, 43.
—— suite of, 15, 16.
—— description of, 25, 26.
Charles II., as King, appoints new council, 79.
—— reaction in favour of, 79.
—— invited to Ireland, 80.
—— proclaimed conditionally in Scotland, 80.
—— resolves to go to Ireland, 82, 83, 102.
—— appeals to States-General for money, 83.
—— attempts to reconcile Montrose with Engagers, 87-88.
—— resents conduct of Engagers, 88, 89.
—— receives Commissioners from Scotland, 91.
—— Scottish ministers pleased with, 92.
—— temporises with Commissioners, 92.
—— plans to marry to Princess Sophie or a Princess of Orange, 93.
—— admiration of, for Sophie, 94-95.
—— removal from Hague necessary, 96-97.
—— consults Montrose and Engagers, 98.
—— rejects Scottish terms, 99.

Charles II., as King, adopts definite Royalist policy, 99.
—— commissions Montrose for Scotland, 99.
—— begged not to sanction declaration, 100.
—— lent money by States-General, 103.
—— goes to France, 103-104.
—— visits French Court at Compiègne, 104, 107-109.
—— renews courtship of Mademoiselle, 105-111, 325, 336-342.
—— indifference of, to Mademoiselle, 108-109.
—— offended by Mademoiselle, 342.
—— quarrels with the Queen, 112, 113.
—— influenced by Elliot, 113.
—— desires to make Wyndham Secretary of State, 114, 249.
—— contended for by rival factions, 116, 440-443.
—— dissuaded from going to Ireland, 117.
—— spends winter in Jersey, 119-128.
—— loses reputation, 121.
—— has small hopes of foreign aid, 121.
—— relies on Montrose, 121, 127, 128.
—— sends to Ireland for news, 121, 125.
—— miserable condition of, 123.
—— receives new overtures from Scotland, 123-125.
—— vacillates between Argyle and Montrose, 125-126.
—— agrees to receive Scottish Commissioners at Breda, 126, 127.
—— journey to Breda, 129-131.
—— conference of, with Queen, 129-130.
—— parts from Queen in anger, 130.
—— crisis in career of, 131.
—— receives report from England, 132.
—— promises to adhere to Cavalier policy, 133.
—— permits Cavaliers to take Engagement, 133.
—— treats with Scots at Breda, 134-141.
—— warned against Scots, 131, 132, 135.
—— hesitates and temporises, 137.
—— harassed by contending factions, 137.
—— distrusted by Scots, 138.
—— advice of Prince of Orange to, 138, 141.
—— anger of, against Scots, 138.
—— disappointed of other hopes, 138-139.
—— beguiled by promises of Scots, 139.
—— threatens to break the treaty, 140, 157.
—— agrees to Scottish terms, 139, 141.
—— friends indignant with, 142.
—— cavaliers cool towards, 142.
—— anger of Queen with, 143.
—— grief of sister for, 143.
—— sends excuses to Ormonde and Montrose, 144-145.
Charles II., as King, attempts to provide for their safety, 144-145.
—— sends Fleming to Scotland, 145.
—— distrusts Argyle, 145, 398, 403.
—— hears of Montrose's defeat and death, 154, 156.
—— said to have disowned Montrose, 155.
—— struggles of, with Commissioners, 155.
—— Scots require new concessions from, 158.
—— embarks in ignorance of new conditions, 158.
—— sails for Scotland, 158, 289.
—— rejects new conditions, 159.
—— final struggle of, yields, and takes covenant, 159-160, 321.
—— lands in Scotland, 162.
—— friends removed from, 163, 188-189.
—— journey of, to Falkland, 164.
—— required to dismiss English adherents, 165, 166.
—— warned to be patient, 165.
—— dissembles, 166, 169, 170-171.
—— irksome condition of, 166-168.
—— Argyle resolves to marry to his daughter, 139, 166, 197.
—— Argyle ingratiates himself with, 168, 169.
—— schemes of, in England, 171-172.
—— disappointed in English schemes, 173.
—— journey of, to Dunfermline, 174.
—— receives Anne Murray, 175.
—— sends money to Anne Murray, 175.
—— joins Scottish Army, 175.
—— popularity of, in army, 176.
—— forced to retire from Army, 176.
—— forced to sign new Declaration, 177-180.
—— interview of, with Dr. King, 179-180.
—— protests his affection for English Church, 179.
—— complains of Scots' insincerity, 180.
—— rejoices at Scottish defeat, 185.
—— 'amuses' Argyle with promises, 186, 197.
—— forms Royalist party in Highlands, 186, 187.
—— friendship of, for Buckingham, 187-188.
—— confidence of, betrayed by Buckingham, 188.
—— flight of, to Highlands, 189-190.
—— overtaken and induced to return, 190-191.
—— hypocrisy of, 191, 194.
—— improved position of, 191.
—— obtains terms for Royalists, 192.
—— repudiated by Remonstrants, 192-193.
—— coronation of, 194, 195.

Charles II., as King, becomes King in fact as well as name, 195, 196.
—— affection of, for Hamilton, 196.
—— asks consent of Queen to marriage with Argyle's daughter, 197.
—— energy and ability of, 198.
—— tact of, 199.
—— secures repeal of Act of Classes, 199.
—— made commander-in-chief, 199.
—— success and triumph of, 199-200.
—— refuses to treat with Cromwell, 200.
—— musters forces at Stirling, 201.
—— marches to England, 201, 202.
—— friends in England betrayed, 204.
—— schemes of English Royalists for frustrated, 205, 206.
—— march of, through England, 206, 325-327.
—— refuses to make Buckingham commander-in-chief, 207.
—— tries to cheer Leslie, 208.
—— courage and spirit of, 208.
—— ill-success of, 209, 210.
—— at Worcester, 210-213.
—— resolves to fight, 213.
—— conduct of, in battle, 214-215, 216.
—— gallantry of, 221-222.
—— nearly captured, 216.
—— escapes with cavalry, 216.
—— desires to rally Scots, 216.
—— message of Derby to, 216.
—— anxiety of government to capture, 220.
—— reward offered for, 220, 232, 242, 244.
—— description of, 220.
—— death of, rumoured, 221, 250, 256.
—— detaches himself from Scots, 222.
—— desires to go to London, 222, 225, 227.
—— guided to Whiteladies, 223-224.
—— disguised by Penderels, 225-227.
—— at Hobbal Grange, 227.
—— decides to go to Wales, 227.
—— goes to Madeley, 228-229.
—— fatigue and depression of, 230-231.
—— returns to Whiteladies, 230.
—— sheltered at Boscobel, 230-234.
—— Wilmot's loyalty to, 234, 235, 238, 239.
—— goes to Moseley, 236.
—— sheltered by Whitgreave and Hudleston, 238-242.
—— sees his defeated soldiers, 240.
—— search for, at Boscobel, 240-241.
—— alarmed by soldiers, 241.
—— goes to Bentley, 242-243.
—— at Bentley, 243.
—— rides with Jane Lane to Bristol, 244-246.
—— adventures of, at Bromsgrove, 244.
—— —— at Wotton, 245.
—— —— at Stratford, 245.
—— —— at Long Marston, 245.

Charles II., as King, fails to make Wilmot adopt disguise, 246.
—— at Abbots Leigh, 246-249.
—— feigns illness, 246, 249.
—— recognised by butler, 247-248.
—— fails to get ship, 248.
—— decides to go to Trent, 248-249.
—— sends Wilmot to Trent, 249.
—— journey to Trent, 250-251.
—— joyful reception of, at Trent, 251, 254.
—— takes leave of Jane Lane, 252.
—— ship sought for, 254.
—— danger of, at Trent, 256.
—— goes to Charmouth as groom, 256.
—— meets Ellesdon at Monkton Wylde, 257.
—— nearly betrayed, 257.
—— waits for boat at Charmouth, 257-258.
—— fails to get boat, 258.
—— goes to Bridport as groom, 258-261.
—— pursuit of, 259-260.
—— peril of, 261-262.
—— girl mistaken for, 262.
—— at Broadwindsor, 262-263.
—— returns to Trent, 263.
—— sends Wilmot to Salisbury, 263.
—— ship engaged for, fails, 264-265.
—— at Trent, 265-266.
—— goes to Heale, 266.
—— at inn at Mere, 266.
—— received by Mrs. Hyde, 267-268.
—— recognised by Mrs. Hyde, 267.
—— spends day at Stonehenge, 268.
—— search of ship for, 269-271.
—— ship secured for, at Brighton, 271.
—— sets out for Brighton, 272.
—— spends night at Hambledon, 273-274.
—— passes as Roundhead, 274.
—— journey to Brighton, 274-275.
—— at Brighton, 275-278.
—— recognised, 275, 276, 278.
—— embarks at Shoreham, 277-278.
—— promises secrecy, 278, 282.
—— searched for at Shoreham, 278.
—— voyage of, 278-279.
—— lands at Fécamp, 221, 279.
—— goes to Rouen, 279.
—— miserable plight of, 279, 280.
—— meets Queen at Moriceaux, 280.
—— goes to Paris, 280.
—— gives fictitious account of adventures, 280-282.
—— gratitude of, and rewards to friends, 222, 237, 243, 252, 253, 282, 283.
—— cause of unprosperous, 284.
—— embassies of, to Rome, 284, 294, 295.
—— —— to Poland, 285.
—— —— to Moscow, 285.
—— —— to Persia, 285.
—— —— to Morocco, 285.

Charles II., as King, embassies of, to Madrid, 100, 284, 286-293.
—— message from Poland to, 285.
—— Czar sends money to, 286.
—— offers of, to Philip IV. of Spain, 286, 288.
—— Philip IV. professes affection for, 288.
—— ambassadors of, unwelcome in Spain, 286, 292, 293.
—— seeks Papal aid, 294.
—— Pope considers affairs of, 295.
—— Pope rejects overtures of, 295.
—— negotiation harmful to, 173, 295.
—— distrusted by Irish, 144, 298, 305.
—— permits Ormonde to leave Ireland, 299.
—— mortgages towns to Lorraine, 302.
—— Ormonde sends for instructions of, 302.
—— consent to James's marriage required, 304.
—— intrusts Ireland to Queen, 306.
—— pardons Browne and Plunckett, 308.
—— bids James submit to Queen, 310, 318, 319.
—— loses friend in Prince of Orange, 315, 316.
—— dislike of, for Jermyn, 197, 311, 481.
—— desires Ormonde to attend James, 325.
—— anxiety felt for, 327.
—— rumours about, 328.
—— returns to Paris, 308, 328, 334, 438.
—— friendship of Condé for, 331, 348-349.
—— melancholy of, 325, 362.
—— wishes to marry Mademoiselle, 325, 336-337.
—— Mlle. considers him improved, 337-338.
—— changes in, 337-338.
—— turns to Mme. de Châtillon, 342-344.
—— offers her marriage, 344.
—— visits her at Merlou, 344-345.
—— permits James to join Turenne, 348, 453, 454.
—— sufferings of, in Fronde, 348.
—— mediates between King and Princes, 349.
—— negotiates with Lorraine for King, 349, 351-353.
—— persuades Lorraine to retreat, 353.
—— rage of Princes and Frondeurs against, 348, 353-354.
—— leaves Paris, 356.
—— returns to Paris, 356.
—— visits Mademoiselle, 357.
—— thanked by Louis XIV., 358.
—— protests against sending of French envoy to England, 360.
—— resolves to quit France, 360.
—— Mazarin keeps Charles a pensioner of France, 361.
Charles II., as King, induces Irish soldiers to desert Spain, 362.
—— attitude of France towards, 361, 362, 363.
—— seeks foreign alliances, 363-388.
—— sends embassy to Brussels, 363.
—— seeks invitation to Vienna, 363-364.
—— quarrels with Lorraine, 364-365.
—— anger of Condé with, 366.
—— enmity of Spain towards, 366.
—— attitude of Empire towards, 366, 367, 369, 371, 372.
—— sends embassy to the Diet, 366-373.
—— Diet grants money to, 373.
—— hopes for new negotiation with Rome, 374-375.
—— conversion of, demanded by Pope, 374.
—— hopes for Dutch alliance, 375-376.
—— friendship of Borell for, 376, 385.
—— overtures of, to Dutch, 376, 380, 381, 434.
—— negotiates for France with Dutch, 378.
—— freedom of Dutch ports granted to, 378-379.
—— distrusted by Dutch, 376, 379.
—— sends ambassador to Denmark, 381.
—— attitude of Denmark towards, 381-383, 387.
—— favoured by Orange party in Holland, 376, 383.
—— Princess of Orange forbidden to receive, 383.
—— attempts to reconcile Mary with the Dowager and Count William, 384.
—— asks Mary's favour for Borell, 384-385.
—— scheme to marry to Queen Christina, 387-388.
—— relations of, with Sweden, 387-388.
—— friendless condition of, 389, 494-495.
—— seeks help for Scotland, 389.
—— attempts to save Dunnottar Castle, 390.
—— friends of, in Highlands, 390, 391.
—— messages of Scottish Royalists to, 391-392.
—— answer of, to Scots, 392.
—— makes Middleton commander-in-chief, 392.
—— sends Middleton to Holland, 392.
—— asks Mary's aid for Middleton, 393.
—— asks loan of Mary's credit, 394.
—— disappointed in Highlanders, 394-395.
—— plans of, betrayed, 396-397, 421-422.
—— warns chiefs against Bampfylde, 396-397.
—— hopes to unite all Scottish parties, 398.
—— exhorts friends to unity, 399, 403, 404, 407, 410.

Charles II., as King, appoints Glencairn as General, 399, 403.
—— permits Wogan's adventure, 401.
—— alleged plot to murder, 405-406.
—— coldness of, to Balcarres, 406.
—— urged to go to Scotland, 409, 477.
—— offers to go to Scotland, 409, 477, 489.
—— attempts to send succours to Scotland, 410.
—— hears of Scottish failure, 411.
—— hopes of, in Ireland, 412.
—— despairs of Ireland, 413.
—— English Royalists alienated from, 142, 173, 413.
—— reaction in favour of, 413-416, 417.
—— said to intend marriage with Cromwell's daughter, 415.
—— proposal to restore, 416.
—— hopes in Lambert, 416.
—— Lilburne offers to aid, 417.
—— Presbyterians declare for, 419.
—— sends Armorer to England, 420.
—— authorises Sealed Knot, 421.
—— relies on Cavaliers, 413, 421, 441-443.
—— plans of, betrayed, 421-422, 428.
—— plots against, 423.
—— alleged complicity of, in Henshaw's Plot, 423-425, 427.
—— supposed proclamation of, 423.
—— troubles of, in Paris, 429.
—— money sent to, 436.
—— summons Hyde and Nicholas to Paris, 438.
—— regrets Nicholas's absence, 438.
—— torn by rival factions, 440-443.
—— refuses to go to Charenton, 380, 442, 443.
—— detests Presbyterians and Scots, 441-443.
—— confers with De Retz, 445.
—— Queen reads letter of, 446.
—— obtains new seal, 450.
—— chooses new Council, 451.
—— affection of, for Wilmot, 451.
—— refuses to make Berkeley Councillor, 452-453.
—— accuses Long of treason, 455.
—— dismisses Long, 456.
—— arrests Wogan, 457.
—— hopes for money on Rupert's return, 462.
—— disappointed, 462-463.
—— receives Rupert cordially, 463.
—— makes Herbert Lord-keeper, 463.
—— goes to Chantilly, 466.
—— weary of Paris and Queen, 466.
—— summons Henry to Paris, 466.
—— gaieties of, in Paris, 467.
—— said to be reconciled with Queen, 468.
—— attempts to remove Hyde from, 468, 469-476.
Charles II., as King, investigates charges against Hyde, 470-476.
—— declares confidence in Hyde, 473-474, 476.
—— increases favour to Hyde, 476-477.
—— urged to leave France, 477, 489.
—— anxious to leave France, 483-484.
—— can find no other refuge, 483-484, 490.
—— obtains money by sale of guns, 484-485, 490.
—— repudiates debts, 486-487.
—— quarrels with Rupert, 486-488, 491, 492.
—— refuses to send James to Scotland, 488.
—— obtains money from Emperor, 489.
—— obtains money from English loyalists, 431-432, 489.
—— promised pension by Mazarin, 490.
—— takes leave of French Court, 490.
—— fails to be reconciled with Queen, 490-491.
—— anger of, with Rupert, Herbert, and Berkeley, 491.
—— entertained by Duchesse d'Aiguillon, 492.
—— obtains audience of Queen for Hyde, 492.
—— takes leave of Queen, 493.
—— sets out from Paris, 493.
—— sees James at Peronne, 493.
—— at Cambrai, 493.
—— receives English envoys at Mons, 494.
—— approves plans for new Royalist rising, 494.
—— joins Mary at Spa, 494.
—— low condition of, 494-495.
—— quarrels of, with Queen, 112-115, 130, 143, 429, 444-445, 490-491.
—— jealousy of James, 129, 488, 495.
—— influenced by Hyde, 100, 344, 443, 444.
—— swayed by Queen, 439, 443, 448, 449, 461.
—— swayed by Jermyn, 448, 481.
—— general dissatisfaction with, 475, 477-479.
—— character of, 5, 6, 7, 161, 243, 337-338, 362, 447-449, 450, 460, 461, 475, 477, 479, 481, 488, 491, 495.
—— illness of, 65, 465-466.
—— licentious life of, 477, 481-483.
—— religion of, 9, 10, 11, 106, 142, 173, 179, 321, 379, 442-443, 478-479.
—— chapel of, 321-323.
—— chaplains of, 135, 137.
—— affairs of, 1, 64, 116, 440, 462.
—— poverty of, 1, 23, 48, 63, 83, 103, 120, 123, 131, 175, 280-281, 335, 348, 372-373, 392, 393-394, 429-437, 483, 484-485, 489.
—— sources of income, 430-432.

Charles II., as King, pension of, 348, 430, 490.
—— reported luxury of, 437.
—— creditors of, 486, 487, 490.
—— letters of, 121, 127, 128, 147, 155-156, 172, 298, 316, 317, 368, 378, 379, 384, 385, 393, 394, 395, 404, 407, 409, 439, 483, 485, 490.
—— letters to, 85, 87, 99, 147, 379, 457, 482.
—— correspondents of, 203.
—— adherents of, 495.
—— servants of, 103, 120.
—— cook of, 233.
—— writing-master of, 470.
—— physician of, 196, 439.
—— resident of in Paris, 435.
—— papers of, 457-458.
—— seal of, 490.
—— ships of, 379, 430-431.
—— horses of, 314, 315, 348, 436.
—— jest of, 447.
—— declarations of, 51, 100, 177-179, 211, 473.
—— petitions to, 468, 469-470.
—— court of, 4, 5, 83, 188, 356, 429, 438, 440-441, 458-461, 464.
Charles IV. of Lorraine. *See* Lorraine.
Charles Louis, Elector Palatine of the Rhine, 93, 368, 369, 371, 373, 484.
—— letter to, 368.
Charmouth, adventures of King at, 255, 256-259, 260.
Châtillon, Duc de (Gaspard de Coligny), 34, 342.
—— Duchesse de (Isabelle-Angélique de Montmorenci), 34, 342-345, 349, 493.
Cheshire, militia of, 208.
Chevreuse, Duchesse de (Marie de Rohan), 332, 350.
Chiesly, Sir John, 186.
Childrens' Riot, the, 382.
Chirk Castle, 210.
Choisy Hotel, ball at, 31.
Christian IV. of Denmark, 37, 123.
Christina, Queen of Sweden, 122, 141, 387-388.
Church, Anglican, 2, 7, 8, 10, 135, 142, 179, 185, 321-323, 477-479.
Cirencester, King at, 246.
Civil War, first, 6, 11, 186, 211, 414.
—— second, 37, 38, 39, 40-41, 59-60.
Clanricarde, Marquis of (Ulick de Burgh), 3, 24, 68, 180, 290, 298, 306, 307, 308.
—— made deputy-lieutenant, 299.
—— sends commissioners to Lorraine, 305-307.
—— repudiates treaty with Lorraine, 307.
—— retires to England, 308.
Clergy, Dutch, 73.
—— Roman Catholic, 68.
Cleveland, Earl of (Thomas Wentworth), 126, 136, 158, 188, 190, 215, 218, 238.
Clonmel, 297.
Coke, Thomas, 204.
—— confession of, 204.
Colchester, siege of, 52, 59.
Cologne, kings of, 240.
—— Elector of, 368.
Comminges, M. de, 108.
Commonwealth, English, 2, 133, 169, 209, 211, 220, 327.
—— establishment of, 80.
—— envoys of, 97, 289-291, 323, 366.
—— foreign relations of, 363, 387-388, 359.
—— at war with Dutch, 375-387.
—— oath to be faithful to, 169, 205.
—— spies of, 2, 130-131, 203, 395, 480, 495.
See also England.
Condé, House of, 18, 20, 343.
—— Prince de (Henri de Bourbon), 13, 27, 31.
—— —— wife of, 21.
—— —— son of, 21.
—— —— daughter of, 21.
—— —— (Louis de Bourbon), 32, 36, 75, 76, 330, 331, 332-333, 342-343, 361, 365.
—— —— forms new Fronde, 329.
—— —— arrested, 329.
—— —— leaves Paris, 333.
—— —— at war with Court, 345-348, 349-351.
—— —— defeat of, 355-357.
—— —— relations of, with Charles II., 348, 354, 356, 366.
—— —— arrogance of, 27, 329, 332.
—— —— intrigues of, in England, 359.
—— —— levies of, 335.
—— —— Irish soldiers of, 366.
—— —— English soldiers of, 424.
—— —— sister of, 329.
—— —— brother of, 332.
—— —— cousin of, 342.
—— —— friend of, 342.
See also D'Enghien.
—— Princesse de (Charlotte de Montmorenci), 21, 25.
—— —— (Claire-Clémence de Maillé-Brézé), 329.
Confederates, Irish, *see* Ireland.
Coningsby, Juliana (Mrs. Amyas Hext), aids King's escape, 250, 253, 256, 258, 261, 263, 266, 267.
Constantinople, embassy to, 203.
—— agent of Commonwealth at, 366.
Constant Reformation, the, 54, 57, 462.
Constant Warwick, the, 52, 65.
Conti, Prince de (Armand de Bourbon), 75, 329, 332.
Coote, Sir Charles, 296.
Corbiesdale, battle of, 148, 154.
Cornwall, Royalists in, 132.
Cosins, Dr. John, chaplain in Paris, 321-322.

Cotterel, Sir Charles, 437.
Cottington, Francis, Lord, 49, 61, 64, 79, 103, 114, 290, 452.
—— on embassy to Spain, 100, 103, 284, 286-293.
—— jest of, 114-116.
—— death of, 293.
Cotton, Mrs., 223.
Council of Prince of Wales, 7, 8.
—— averse to departure of Prince from Jersey, 9-16.
—— remains in Jersey, 15, 16, 24, 36.
—— in France, 37, 49.
—— at Hague, 63-66.
—— factions in, 63-66.
—— right of, to discuss Scottish affairs denied, 62.
Council of Charles II., 79, 96, 112, 123-124, 137, 461, 495.
—— sworn on death of Charles I., 79, 112.
—— Nicholas and Hopton excluded from, 137.
—— factions in, 81, 137, 495.
—— members added to, 459, 465.
—— slighted, 461.
Council of State, English, 171, 203, 210, 359, 417, 418, 419, 421, 424, 426, 480.
Courland, Duke of, 122.
Court. *See* Charles II., Henrietta, France.
Coutances, Bishop of, 118, 129.
Covenant, the Solemn League, and, 41, 42, 117, 124, 133, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 151, 156, 159, 160, 170, 194, 209, 211, 413.
—— King takes, 159, 160.
—— King protests devotion to, 194.
—— King signs at coronation, 195.
—— Presbyterians of Lancashire insist on, 209.
—— religion to be settled according to, 211.
—— acceptance of, by King, alienates Cavaliers, 142-143, 173, 413, 421.
—— King renounces, 413, 440-443.
Covenanters, 80, 123, 127, 128, 134, 142, 145, 147, 157, 185, 192, 193, 199.
—— proclaim King conditionally, 80.
—— overtures of, to King, 80-81, 91-92, 98-99, 123-127.
—— treaty of King with, 135-144, 157-161.
—— treat King as prisoner, 164-168, 179, 180.
—— force King to sign a declaration, 177-179.
—— defeat of, at Dunbar, 181-183, 184-186. *See* also Scotland.
Coventry, John, 264, 265.
Cowley, Abraham, 316.
Craven, William, Lord, 419.
Crawford, Earl of (Ludovick Lindsay), 55, 195, 199, 202.
Crelly, Father, 294.
Cresswell, William, 225.
Crispe, Nicholas, 132.
Crofts, James (James Stuart, Duke of Monmouth), 70.
Crofts, William, 54, 284, 285, 342, 344, 450.
—— sent to Poland, 284.
—— letter to, 206.
Cromwell, Oliver, 40, 60, 61, 62, 80, 133, 169, 186, 190, 201, 202, 209, 212, 213, 215, 219, 244, 293, 294, 297, 360, 361, 367, 372, 382, 396, 400, 409, 414, 415, 417, 455, 480, 493, 494.
—— in Ireland, 117, 121, 125, 139, 296, 297.
—— in Scotland, 169, 170, 172, 176, 180, 181, 182, 183, 200-201, 326.
—— defeats Scots at Dunbar, 182-183.
—— follows King to England, 201, 202, 210-212.
—— defeats King at Worcester, 213-215, 219.
—— treaty of, with Dutch, 386.
—— relations of, with France, 358-360, 388, 394.
—— —— with Spain, 358, 359, 360, 388, 393, 394.
—— assumes dictatorship, 414.
—— made Protector, 419.
—— unpopular in England, 414-416, 418-419.
—— officers adhere to, 415.
—— proclamation against, 423.
—— plot to murder, 418, 421-427.
—— claims Rupert's ships, 485.
—— illness of, 200.
—— his opinion of Charles II., 198.
—— Condé's admiration for, 366.
—— Hyde said to be pensioner of, 470-472.
—— interview of Seymour with, 489.
—— daughter of, 415.
—— army of, 171, 173, 177, 178, 494.
—— soldiers of, 172, 180, 210.
—— letters of, 183, 219.
Culpepper, John, Lord, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 48, 49, 50, 52-53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 64, 65, 79, 81, 92, 124, 315, 378; 417, 419, 468, 469.
—— goes on embassy to Moscow, 285, 315.
Cunningham, Dr., 196.
Curtius, Sir William, 367.
Cusance, Beatrix de, 301.

D

DALNASPIDAL, defeat of Middleton at, 410.
Dalziel, Major-General Thomas, 408.
Davenant, Sir William, 50.
Davis, Justice, 455.
Davison, Mr., 420.

Day, John, 270.
D'Aiguillon, Duchesse, 341, 492.
Deal, Castle of, 46, 51, 52.
Deane, Colonel, 395, 426.
De Bote, ——, 480.
Declaration issued by Prince of Wales, 51.
—— drawn up by Hyde, 100.
—— King forced to sign by Scots, 177-179.
—— issued by King at Worcester, 211.
—— desired by Presbyterians, 419.
De Gondi, Paul. *See* Retz.
De la Meilleraie, Marquis, 485.
De la Rivière, Abbé, 105, 107, 109.
De la Torre, Diego, 67.
D'Elbœuf, Duc (Charles de Lorraine), 75, 129.
—— sons of, 75.
De Motteville, Madame (Louise Bessin de Mathonville), 25, 29, 35, 36, 48, 343.
D'Enghien, Duc (Louis de Bourbon), 21, 27.
See also Condé.
Denmark, 37, 387, 389.
—— fleet of, 381.
—— Kings of. *See* Christian IV. and Frederick III.
D'Epernon, Duc, 467.
—— Duchesse, 30.
—— Mademoiselle, 30.
Derby, Earl of (James Stanley), 171, 203, 205, 208, 210, 213, 218, 222, 223, 224, 225, 238.
—— defeated at Wigan, 209.
—— capture and execution of, 218.
—— message of, to King, 218.
—— son of, 218.
—— officers of, 218.
—— troops of, 209, 210.
—— messenger of, 203.
Desborough, General John, 426.
D'Estrées, Gabrielle, 20.
De Vic, Sir Henry, 312, 364.
De Witt, John, 382, 383, 386, 387.
—— Vice-Admiral Cornelius, 378.
D'Hocquincourt, Marquis (Charles de Monchy), 346, 347.
Dickson, David, 165, 178.
Diet, Imperial, 122, 123, 366, 369, 371, 372, 450.
—— Charles II. sends Ambassador to, 366, 371-372, 450.
—— votes subsidy to Charles II., 372.
Digby, George, Lord, 4, 11, 12-14, 16, 24, 55, 112, 113-115, 342-344, 459.
—— Colonel John, 422.
—— Sir Kenelm, 480.
Dillon, Colonel, 361.
—— Father George, 303, 305.
Dillon, Thomas, Viscount, 180.
Dorislaus, Isaac, 96, 97, 290, 422.
—— murder of, 97.
Douglas, Sir John, 214.
Douglas, Sir Joseph, 81.
—— Robert (Moderator of the General Assembly of the Kirk), 195.
Drogheda, massacre of, 121, 219.
Drummond, William, 404.
Dudhope, Lord (John Scrimgeour), 189, 190.
—— house of, 189.
Dunbar, Scots defeated at, 175, 181, 182, 183, 200, 203, 215, 293.
Duncannon, fort of, 302.
Dundee stormed by Monk, 219.
Dunfermline, Earl of (Charles Seton), 41, 163, 174, 189, 199.
—— wife of, 174.
—— Countess of, 174.
Dunkirk taken by Spain, 359.
Dunnottar Castle, 163, 390.
Dutch, 97, 376, 379, 434, 478. *See also* Netherlands.
Dyrham, 248, 250, 253.
Dysart, Earl of (William Murray), accused of plotting King's murder, 405-406.

E

EARLES, Dr. John, 16, 26, 27, 52, 280.
Edgeman William (secretary of Hyde), 433, 470.
Edinburgh, 149, 165, 181, 400.
—— Provost of, 152.
Eglinton, Earl of (Alexander Montgomery), 175, 178, 199, 371.
—— son of, 176, 190.
Elbœuf, Duc d'. *See* D'Elbœuf.
Electors, College of, 371.
Elizabeth, Queen of England, 162.
Elizabeth Stuart, Princess of England, 43, 44, 143, 317.
Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, 69, 93, 94, 95, 104.
—— children of, 69, 93, 94, 104.
—— household of, 319, 437.
—— house of, 315.
Elizabeth, Princess Palatine, 69.
Ellesdon, Captain William, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 283.
Elliot, Thomas, 113-116, 311, 312.
Erskine, Lady Anne, 174.
—— Arthur, 163.
Emperor (Ferdinand III.) of Austria, 32, 33, 34, 86, 110, 111, 122, 339, 363, 366, 367, 369, 370, 383, 388, 494.
—— promises money to Charles II., 372, 373, 489.
—— intercedes for Charles II. with Pope, 374.
Empire, Princes of, 367, 368, 370-373, 388, 484, 489, 494.
—— collect money for Charles II., 371-373.
Empress, death of, 33, 109.

Engagement (Hamilton's), 41, 42, 51, 67, 68, 163, 186.
—— (English, *i.e.* Oath to be faithful to Commonwealth), 133, 142, 169, 205.
Engagers (Hamiltonian), 60, 61, 84, 87-90, 95, 98, 136, 139, 140, 157, 163, 164, 173, 176, 177, 185-186, 194, 199.
Enghien, Duc d'. *See* D'Enghien.
England, 22, 24, 37, 39, 40, 41, 80, 96, 201, 210, 293.
—— parties in, 39, 40, 413-415.
—— royalist reaction in, 40, 132, 415-416, 418-419.
—— royalist insurrection plotted in, 42, 171-173, 421-422, 426, 494, 495.
—— panic in, 169.
—— royalists defeated in, 59.
—— Scottish invasion of, 60, 205-213.
—— Scots defeated in, 60, 213-216.
—— effects of battle of Worcester in, 219.
—— conquest of Scotland by, 183, 200, 219, 389-390, 410-411.
—— union of, with Scotland, 389.
—— conquest of Ireland by, 121, 296-297, 308-309, 412-413.
—— affection of King for, 163, 171.
—— adventures of King in, 222-279.
—— relations of, with Netherlands, 96, 316, 318-319, 375-376, 382, 386.
—— at war with Netherlands, 360, 377-383.
—— treaty of, with Netherlands, 386, 421.
—— relations of, with France, 22, 345, 358, 360, 494.
—— relations of, with Spain, 286, 289-290, 292-293, 358, 360, 494.
—— relations of, with other States, 371, 387-388.
—— army of, 39, 40, 41, 172, 178, 182, 200, 414, 415.
—— factions in army of, 40, 414-415.
—— ships of, 43, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 117, 162, 292, 376, 377, 386.
—— agents of, 97, 289-292, 319, 345, 366.
—— newspapers of, 162, 163.
—— court of, 29.
—— crown of, 41.
England, Government of, 60, 169, 172, 173, 202, 203, 205, 265.
—— vigilance of, 169, 172, 203, 205, 220, 413, 428.
—— unpopularity of, 414.
—— changed from Commonwealth to Protectorate, 414-417.
—— releases Henry of Gloucester, 466.
England, Parliament of (Long Parliament), 2, 12, 36, 39, 40, 43, 46, 53, 67, 69, 71, 96, 97, 139, 143, 159, 160, 202, 205, 218, 289-290, 299, 417.
—— —— abolishes Monarchy, 80.
—— —— factions in, 39, 40.
—— —— passes Navigation Act, 375.
—— —— corruption of, 414.
England, Parliament of (Long Parliament), dissolved by Cromwell, 414.
—— —— (Short Parliament), 419.
See also Commonwealth, Council of State, Royalists in England.
Epernon. *See* D'Epernon.
Essex, Royalist rising in, 59.
Estates, Committee of. *See* Scotland.
Etampes, siege of, 349, 351.
Evans, Rhys ap, 418.
Evelith Mill, adventure of King at, 228, 230.
Evelyn, John, his description of Mrs. Barlow, 70.
Exiles. *See* Royalists.
Eythin, Lord (James King), 133.

F

FAIRFAX, Thomas, Viscount, 8, 43, 52, 59, 71, 169, 172, 455.
Falkland, King at, 164.
Fanshaw, Sir Richard, 198.
—— Lady, 337.
Ferns, Bishop of, 307.
Fetherstonhaugh, Sir Timothy, 218.
Fife, 186, 191, 201.
—— loyalty of, to King, 186, 191.
Fifth-Monarchists, 414, 419.
Fisher, Sir Clement, 246, 252.
—— George, 290, 292.
Fitz-James, Colonel John, 425, 426, 480.
Fleet, Parliamentary, 43, 52, 56, 57, 117, 172, 292, 359, 376, 377, 386.
—— Royalist, 46, 47, 50, 56. 57, 63, 65, 66, 117, 430, 462.
—— —— sails for Holland, 46.
—— —— joined by James, 46-47.
—— —— joined by Prince of Wales, 50.
—— —— proceedings of, in Channel, 51-58.
—— —— mutinous condition of, 63, 65.
—— —— Rupert takes command of, 66.
—— —— sails for Ireland, 66.
—— —— off Spanish coast, 292.
—— —— sails for West Indies, 430.
—— —— returns to France, 462.
Fleetwood, General Charles, 169, 205, 212, 213, 214.
Fleming, Sir William, 145, 146, 154, 155, 217.
—— mission of, to Montrose, 145-146.
Forbes, Sir Alexander, 214.
Foster, Sir Richard, 435.
Fouquet, Abbé, 342.
Fox, Somerset, implicated in plot to murder Cromwell, 426, 427.
France, 21, 24, 28, 37, 38, 71, 73, 105.
—— condition of, 21, 284, 329-333.
—— proposes alliance with Dutch, 377, 378.
—— relations of, with England, 22, 345, 358, 360, 388.
—— treats with England, 359-360, 388, 494.

France, attitude of, towards Charles II., 22, 117, 118, 358, 361-363, 377, 475, 483, 484.
—— Charles departs from, 493.
—— fleet of, 359, 377.
—— embassy of, at Hague, 319.
—— clergy of, 323.
—— nobles of, 19, 20, 22.
France, court of, 9, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 75, 78, 117, 330, 343, 431, 485, 490.
—— —— flies from Paris, 75.
—— —— treats with Fronde, 78, 328-329.
—— —— triumphs over Fronde, 328.
—— —— opposes Charles's suit for Mademoiselle, 32.
—— —— favours Charles's suit, 105-106, 341.
—— —— attitude of, towards Charles II., 25-26, 35-36, 117, 358, 361-363, 483.
—— —— kindness of, to James of York, 327, 362, 488.
—— —— levity of, 27, 28, 36, 467.
Fraser, Dr. Alexander (physician to Charles II.), 124, 165, 186-187, 196, 438, 459, 465, 476.
—— intrigues against Hyde, 468.
—— character of, 459.
—— James, 152.
Freake, Christopher, 415.
Frederick III., King of Denmark, 122, 381-383, 392, 393, 480.
Friesland, Duke of, 122.
—— States of, 316.
Fronde, war of (old Fronde), 74, 328, 329, 330, 332.
—— (of the Princes), 329, 330, 345-357.
Frondeurs, 78, 329-330, 332, 346-347, 357.
—— levity of, 74, 330, 345.
Fry, Major, 419.
Fuensaldagna, Condé de (Don Alonso Perez de Vivero), 286.

G

GALWAY, 297, 300, 308.
Garmouth, Charles II. lands at, 162.
Gaston. *See* Orleans, Gaston d'.
Gerard, Anne (daughter of Thomas Gerard), 248.
—— Charles, Lord, 24, 54, 55, 126, 171, 311, 312, 327, 419, 425, 464, 472.
—— —— conversation of, with Hyde, 475, 477.
—— —— accuses Hyde of aspersing King, 472, 474-477.
—— Charles, 427.
—— John, implicated in plot to murder Cromwell, 425-427.
—— —— execution of, 427.
—— Major, 425.
Ghent, King at, 130.
Giffard, Charles, 222-223, 225.
Giffard, George, 241.
—— John, 223.
—— Thomas, 235.
—— Mrs., 224.
Gillespie, Patrick, 178.
Glamorgan, Earl of (Edward Somerset), 67.
Glencairn, Earl of (William Cunningham), 393, 399, 401, 402-404, 406, 407-408, 410.
—— commands Royalists in Highlands, 399.
—— quarrels with Lorne, 402.
—— quarrels with Balcarres, 403-404.
—— quarrels with Middleton, 407.
—— quits army and makes terms with England, 407, 410.
—— declaration of, 399.
Glengarry, Angus Macdonald of, 392, 394, 397, 402, 404, 407.
Goffe, Dr. Stephen, 47, 48, 72, 158.
—— breaks news of King's death to Charles II., 72.
Gondi, Paul de. *See* Retz.
Gonzague, Anne de (Princess Palatine), 330-332, 340.
—— Marie de (Queen of Poland), 122.
Gounter, Colonel George, 265, 268-271, 282.
—— assists King to escape, 270-278.
—— wife of, 268-270.
—— son of, 282.
—— sister of, 272, 273, 282.
Gounter, Mrs. George, 268-270.
—— Thomas, 268, 270, 272-274.
Gowrie, Earl of, 164.
Grandison, Viscount (John Villiers), 188, 214.
Graves, Colonel Richard, 196.
Grenvile, Sir Richard, 132, 470-472.
—— accuses Hyde of treachery, 470-471.
Groningen, States of, 316, 386.
Guelderland, States of, 383.
Guerchi, Mlle. de, 34.
Guise, Mlle. de, 34.
Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, 122.

H

HALSENOTH, Joan, 250, 253.
Hamilton, James, Duke of, 41, 42, 60, 87-88, 186, 400.
—— enters into 'Engagement' with Charles I., 41-42.
—— invites Prince of Wales to Scotland, 41.
—— invades England, 60.
—— defeat of, 60-61.
—— execution of, 80, 87.
—— letter of Prince of Wales to, 51.
Hamilton, William, Duke of, 87, 88-90, 98, 136, 137, 158, 163, 164-165, 193, 196, 199, 208, 442.

Hamilton, William, Duke of, despair of, 201, 202.
—— —— courage of, 206, 214, 442.
—— —— death of, 214, 217, 218.
—— —— character of, 87-88.
—— —— letters of, 201, 202, 206.
—— —— regiment of, 214.
Hamilton, House of, 96.
Hamilton, Sir William, 215.
Harding, Richard, 165, 166, 175, 197.
Harris, Bartholomew, 480.
Harrison, General Thomas, 201, 202, 205, 206, 208, 209, 212.
—— opposes Cromwell, 414-415.
—— refuses to own Protectorate, 419.
Hatton, Christopher, Lord, 49, 112, 137, 143, 459, 468.
—— letters of, 50, 102, 124, 126, 132, 173, 311, 322, 459, 476.
—— letter to, 417.
Haughton, Elizabeth, 470, 473, 474.
Haynes, Colonel Hezekiah, 261.
Heale, King hidden at, 266, 267-268, 272.
Heenvliet, Baron van (John Poliander van Kirckhoven), 69, 316, 394.
—— house of, 69.
—— wife of, 317.
—— letters to, 316, 317, 394.
Heligoland, treaty of, 159, 165.
Henchman, Dr. Humphrey, 265, 266, 267, 272.
Henderson, Sir John, 480.
Henin, Stephen de, 303, 305.
Henri IV., King of France, 20, 21, 70, 75, 76, 135, 207.
Henrietta Anne, Princess of England, 17, 76.
Henrietta Maria, Queen of England, 8-10, 12-14, 16, 22-26, 32, 37, 39, 47, 48, 71, 72, 74, 80-82, 106, 109, 115, 116, 118, 124, 137, 169, 170, 252, 280-281, 293, 302-304, 308, 321-328, 334, 344, 352, 359, 374, 390, 406, 425, 437, 452-454, 459, 461, 466, 468, 469, 473, 476, 491, 492,
—— sends for Prince of Wales, 8-14.
—— flight of, to France, 17.
—— reception of, in France, 8-19.
—— efforts of, to marry Charles II. to Mlle. de Montpensier, 28-31, 33, 105, 110-111, 335-337, 339, 340.
—— attempts to gain allies for King, 38, 67.
—— plans Royalist rising, 42.
—— desires Presbyterian alliance, 39, 49, 129, 441-443.
—— intrusted with Irish affairs, 67-69, 80-82.
—— urges Charles II. to go to Ireland, 69, 80-82.
—— desires to join the King in prison, 69.
—— hears of the King's death, 77-78.
—— sufferings of, in the Fronde, 74-77, 348, 354-356.
Henrietta Maria, Queen of England, treats Montrose coldly, 85.
—— distrusted by English Royalists, 23, 36-37, 102, 103, 206, 311, 326, 330-331, 478-479.
—— expects to rule Charles II., 22, 102, 111-112.
—— quarrels with Charles II., 112-114, 130, 374, 429, 444-445, 466, 490-491, 495.
—— confers with Charles II. at Beauvais, 129-130.
—— repudiates responsibility for treaty of Breda, 143-144.
—— withholds consent to Charles's marriage with Anne Campbell, 197-198.
—— angry about treaty with Lorraine, 306-307, 310.
—— quarrels with James of York, 310-312, 314, 315, 320-321, 325.
—— grief of, for death of William of Orange, 317.
—— permits James to go to Hague, 318.
—— attempts to convert her household, 321-323, 478.
—— recalls James to Paris, 323-324.
—— loyalty of, to French Crown, 328-331.
—— Scots desire secrecy from, 390, 391.
—— her dislike of Nicholas, 326, 438, 439.
—— her anger against Hyde, 391, 438, 443-445, 446, 447-448, 451, 492-493.
—— desires to convert Charles II., 442-443, 478-479.
—— offended by Long, 454, 456.
—— attempts to conciliate Rupert, 463.
—— allied with 'Swordsmen,' 464, 488.
—— presents Long's petition to Charles II., 469.
—— supports schemes to overthrow Hyde, 469.
—— grieved by Charles's dissolute life, 477.
—— desires to send James to Scotland, 488.
—— Charles fails to be reconciled with, 490-491.
—— Charles takes leave of, 493.
—— courage of, 17-18, 78.
—— character of, 10, 17, 18, 22, 78.
—— influence of, with Charles II., 102, 448, 449, 461.
—— poverty of, 19, 24, 48, 68, 76, 310, 324, 335.
—— pension of, 18, 22, 26, 348, 430.
—— letters of, 9, 13, 14, 18, 69, 312, 317, 360.
—— letters to, 8, 72, 452.
—— servants of, 23, 78, 143.
—— chaplain of, 77.
—— party of, 93, 440, 444-445, 464.
—— Treasurer of, 430.
—— court of, 19, 23, 24, 29, 117, 321-323, 331, 354, 356, 429, 437.

Henriette, Princess Palatine, 69.
Henry Stuart, Duke of Gloucester, 40, 43, 44, 423, 473, 491.
—— proposal to crown, 40, 415.
—— released by English Government, 466.
——tutor of, 466.
Henshaw, Major Thomas, plots Cromwell's murder, 424-427.
Herbert, Sir Edward, 116, 311-313, 458, 463, 480, 488, 489, 491.
—— instigates James's flight to Brussels, 311-313.
—— attempts to overthrow Hyde, 465, 469, 472-476.
—— character of, 323, 458, 464.
Hertford, Marquis of (William Seymour), 171.
—— steward of, 250.
Hesse Cassel, Landgraf of, 373.
Hessin, Guibert, 486, 487.
Hewitt, ——, 264.
Hext, Amyas, wife of, 253.
See Coningsby, Juliana.
High Court of Justice, 169, 419, 427.
Highlanders, 213, 214, 240.
See also Royalists, Scottish.
Hobbal Grange, 323.
—— King at, 327-328.
Hobbes, Thomas, 27.
Hocquincourt. *See* d'Hocquincourt, Marquis.
Hodges, Elizabeth, 470, 471.
Horne, ——, 264.
Holland, Earl of (Henry Rich), 38, 42, 59, 63, 80, 242.
Holland, 389, 345, 375, 379, 388, 494.
—— populace of Royalist in sympathy, 73, 319.
Holland, States of, 38, 58, 73, 82, 83, 204, 284, 383, 393, 483, 494.
—— —— insists on peace with England, 383, 386-387.
—— —— pass exclusion clause, 386.
—— —— refuse to admit Charles to their territory, 483.
Holles, Denzil, 197.
Holmby, 40.
Holstein, Duke of, 381.
Honthorst, Gerard, 93.
Hope, Sir Alexander, 200.
Hopton, Ralph, Lord, 7, 8, 15, 48, 49, 54, 55, 57, 79, 124, 126, 137, 312, 313, 417, 418.
—— chaplain of, 142, 417, 422.
Hounslerdyke, Scottish Commissioners at, 158.
Hudleston, Father John, 234, 235, 236, 240-243.
—— aids King's escape, 237-243.
—— administers last sacraments to King, 243.
—— pupils of, 239.
—— books of, 240.
Huguenots, 21, 22, 345, 360, 442-443.
Huntbach, Mr. John, 234, 235.
Huntly, Marquis of (George Gordon), 98, 157.
—— —— house of, 162.
—— —— men of, 402.
Huntly, Marquis of (Ludovic Gordon), 186, 190, 192, 199, 201, 219, 398.
Hyde, Sir Edward (Chancellor of the Exchequer), 3-8, 10, 12-16, 22, 23, 27, 36, 37, 48, 49, 61, 62, 64, 66, 79, 86-103, 112-115, 131, 135, 157, 259, 284, 290, 286-293, 295, 301, 316, 322-323, 343-345, 349-351, 354, 356, 364, 367, 368, 370, 371, 377, 380, 381, 387, 391, 392, 397, 400, 401, 406, 408, 409, 418, 421, 423, 424, 429, 438, 443-456, 458-461, 464-471, 478-484, 486, 487, 489, 490-493, 495.
—— opposes the Prince's departure from Jersey, 10-16.
—— anxiety of, for Prince, 36-37.
—— summoned to join Prince, 48-49.
—— captured by pirates, 61.
—— joins Prince at Hague, 61.
—— confers with Montrose, 86.
—— conversation of, with Hamilton, 89-90.
—— opposes the King's going to France, 102.
—— conversation of, with Queen, 114.
—— attempts to influence King, 115.
—— goes on embassy to Spain, 100-101, 284.
—— in Spain, 286-293.
—— attempts to reconcile Queen and Court in Paris, 322-323.
—— visits James at Breda, 323.
—— attempts to dissuade King from marriage, 336-337, 344.
—— intrusted with Scottish affairs, 391-392.
—— disapproves murder plot, 423-424.
—— distrusts the Queen, 22, 23, 102-103, 444, 449.
—— enmity of Queen towards, 438, 444-445, 446, 447, 469.
—— quarrel of Berkeley with, 452-453.
—— intrigues against, 465, 467, 468-469.
—— accused of treason, 470-475.
—— acquitted, 473, 476.
—— complaints to, 478, 481-482.
—— attempts to palliate King's failings, 478, 481-482.
—— refuses to remain in France, 484.
—— audience of, with Queen, 492-493.
—— friendship of Ormonde for, 450-451.
—— hard position of, 449, 450-451, 459-461, 467.
—— poverty of, 48, 432-437, 443, 444, 448.
—— policy of, 3, 4, 49, 62, 81, 131, 421.
—— character of, 7, 8.
—— letters of, 3, 4, 27, 48, 73, 82, 101, 124, 141, 287, 343, 365, 369, 371, 375, 408, 420, 421, 431, 432, 434-437, 447,

448, 449, 464-466, 478-481, 483, 484, 486, 489, 490, 495.
Hyde, Sir Edward (Chancellor of the Exchequer), letters to, 135, 325, 459, 421, 460.
—— family of, 293, 323, 433, 444, 471.
—— cousins of, 203, 267.
—— secretary of, 103, 142, 373-374, 433.
Hyde, Frederick, 267.
Hyde, Henry, executed, 203.
Hyde, Lawrence. 370-372.
Hyde, Mrs. (of Heale, Amphillis Tichborne), 266-268.
—— sister of, 268.

I

Inchiquin, Lord (Murrough O'Brien), 68, 180, 296, 304, 306, 324, 435, 459, 465, 473.
—— forces of, 117, 296.
—— letters of, 303-305.
Independents, 38, 39, 41, 133, 294.
Instrument of Government, 419.
Ireland, 11, 13, 16, 38, 42, 60, 67, 68, 99, 103, 125, 139, 144, 170, 179, 363, 412, 413, 495.
—— condition of, 11, 66-67, 117, 125, 296-300, 412-413.
—— parties in, 67, 117, 125.
—— plan to send Prince to, 12, 68-69.
—— English victories in, 67, 125, 296-297, 299, 308.
—— return of Ormonde to, 68.
—— peace made by Ormonde in, 11, 67, 80, 99.
—— Scots demand breaking of peace in, 99, 138, 139-140.
—— King consents to break peace in, 141-142, 157-159.
—— King repudiates concessions to Scots concerning, 144, 179, 180.
—— departure of Ormonde from, 297-299.
—— barbarity of Cromwell in, 121, 296-297.
—— Papal aid sought for, 294.
—— designs of Lorraine on, 302-305.
—— treaty of, with Lorraine, 302-308.
—— English Conquest of, 308-309.
—— Papal Nuncio in, 11, 67, 68, 117, 294, 295.
Ireland, Catholic Confederates in, 11, 67, 80, 117, 294, 296-300.
—— make peace with Ormonde, 11, 67, 80, 99, 117, 139, 140.
—— Scots demand breaking of treaty with, 139, 140.
—— treaty with, broken, 141-142.
—— messages of King to, 144, 179-180.
—— Ormonde discredited with, 144, 297-299.
—— promise allegiance to Clanricarde, 299.
Ireland, Catholic Confederates in, seek foreign aid, 300.
—— accept proposals of Lorraine, 305.
—— reproached by Clanricarde, 305.
—— demand embassy to Rome, 374.
Ireton, General Henry, 297, 299, 300, 400, 455-456.
—— in Ireland, 297-300.
—— death of, 300.
Irish soldiers, loyalty of, 3.
—— transported to France and Spain, 308.
—— desert from Spain and Lorraine, 361, 362, 364, 366.

J

Jaffray, Alexander (Scottish Commissioner at Breda), 91, 134, 158, 160.
James IV., King of Scotland, 390.
James VI., King of Scotland, 164.
James Stuart, Duke of York, 40, 43, 50, 65, 66, 69, 70, 76-77, 129, 252, 280, 300, 302, 306, 310, 319, 334, 339, 340, 360-362, 421, 423, 430, 439, 445, 448, 453, 473, 476, 478, 488, 491, 493.
—— proposal to crown, 40, 415.
—— escape of, from England, 42-46, 174, 175, 395.
—— joins fleet in Holland, 46-48.
—— joins Queen in Paris, 76-77, 310.
—— goes to Jersey, 118, 119.
—— opposes treaty with Scots, 126, 129.
—— proposes to marry Anne de Lorraine, 303-304, 314.
—— quarrel of, with Queen, 310-312, 320, 325.
—— flight of, to Brussels, 312-315.
—— at Rhenen, 315-318.
—— in Holland, 318-324.
—— acts as chief mourner to William of Orange, 319.
—— ordered to return to Paris, 318.
—— returns to Paris, 324.
—— sends for Ormonde, 325.
—— marriage proposed for, 335-336.
—— joins French army, 348, 353, 354, 361, 362.
—— treats with Lorraine for Turenne, 352-353.
—— Irish soldiers desert to, 361, 362, 364, 365.
—— supports Hyde, 473, 476.
—— proposal to send to Scotland, 488.
—— attitude of France towards, 311, 324, 348, 362, 488.
—— Charles's jealousy of, 50, 129, 488, 495.
—— pension of, 323, 324, 325, 430.
—— poverty of, 314, 315, 320, 324, 325, 465.
—— character of, 119, 310, 348, 495.
—— letters of, 315, 465.
—— letter to, 360.

James Stuart, Duke of York, household of, 311, 313, 323.
—— counterfeit of, 369.
—— George and Garter of, 490.
—— dog of, 44.
Jane, Joseph, 131.
Jansenists, 375, 412.
Jarzé, René, Marquis de, 329.
Jermyn, Henry Lord, 9, 10, 13-16, 23, 24, 36, 39, 42, 47-48, 49, 102, 103, 109, 111, 112, 116, 117, 120, 129, 197, 318, 328, 331, 335, 342, 349, 353, 391, 397, 406, 419, 429-430, 451, 452, 454, 458, 459, 461, 463-464, 472, 473, 486, 489.
—— chief officer and confidant of Queen, 10, 23.
—— power of, 23, 50, 429-430, 448, 451, 477, 481.
—— comes to bring Prince to Paris, 13-16.
—— arranges Royalist rising, 42.
—— favours Scottish alliance, 49, 124, 135, 406, 441-443.
—— tells Queen of King's death, 77.
—— presses Charles's suit on 'Mademoiselle,' 105-106.
—— treats with Lorraine, 349, 351.
—— enmity of, towards Hyde, 444-445, 453, 469.
—— allied with Rupert, 463-464, 488.
—— hated by Charles and James, 197, 311, 320, 448, 481.
—— unpopularity of, 433.
—— letters to, 39, 490-491.
—— letter of, 82.
—— agents of, 47-48, 50.
—— faction of, 116.
Jermyn, Sir Thomas, 248.
Jersey, Prince in, 8-16.
—— King in, 118-129.
—— taken by Parliament, 334.
—— governor of, 15, 23, 120, 458.
Jesuits, 375.
Johnston of Warristoun, Archibald, 149, 185.

K

Keane, Colonel, 132, 133, 134, 471.
—— reports state of England to King, 132.
Kenmure, Earl of (Robert Gordon), 402, 407, 408, 410.
—— price on head of, 408.
Kent, 46, 59, 204.
—— Royalist rising in, 59, 204.
Ker, Colonel Gilbert, 186, 192, 193.
Kidderminster, 222.
Kilkenny, 296.
Killigrew, Dr. Henry, 312.
King, Dr. John (Dean of Tuam), 179-180, 200, 298-299.
—— conversation of, with Charles II., 179-180.
King, Dr. John (Dean of Tuam), letter of, 200.
Kinnaird, Montrose at, 148.
—— King at, 164.
Kinnoul, Earl of (William Hay), 147.
Kinnoul, Earl of (Hay), 148.
Kirk. *See* Scotland, Kirk of.
Kirkwall, Montrose at, 147.
Kirton, Edward, 250.
Knox, Henry, 390, 391.

L

Lambert, John, 60, 169, 176, 182, 183, 193, 201, 202, 208, 209, 212.
—— character of, 416.
—— Royalists hope to gain, 416.
—— faction of, 414-416.
—— discontent of, 416.
—— plot to murder, 426.
—— troops of, 210.
Lancashire, 60, 207, 208, 432.
—— influence of Derby in, 208.
—— Presbyterians and Roman Catholics of, send money to King, 432.
Lane, George, 188, 189, 473, 476.
Lane, Jane, 235, 243-246, 249, 251, 252.
Lane, Colonel John, 235, 242, 243, 244, 246, 252-253, 282.
Lane, Sir Richard, 79, 102.
Lanerick, Earl of (William Hamilton), 83, 84, 87.
—— letter to, 54.
—— becomes Duke of Hamilton, 84. *See* Hamilton, Second Duke of.
Langdale, Sir Marmaduke (afterwards Lord Langdale), 42, 60, 381, 464, 465.
—— letter of, 366.
La Rivière. *See* De La Rivière, Abbé.
La Rochefoucauld, François, Duc de, 75, 329.
La Torre. *See* De La Torre, Diego.
Lascelles, Henry, 244, 246, 248, 249.
Lauderdale, Earl of (John Maitland), 41, 54, 55, 56, 61, 62, 68, 83, 84, 87, 93, 96, 98, 136, 158, 163, 165, 177, 186, 189, 193, 199, 206, 218, 219, 222.
—— comes with overtures to Prince of Wales, 54-56, 61-62.
—— influence of, on Hamilton, 88-90.
—— implacability of, towards Montrose, 88-90.
Legge, Colonel William, 52, 89.
Leighton, Colonel, 196.
Leopold, Archduke of Austria, Governor of Spanish Netherlands, 34, 35, 77, 86, 104, 286, 293, 300, 363, 365, 493.
Leslie, David, 148, 149, 173, 174, 176, 180-183, 184, 186, 187, 192, 199, 201, 207, 208, 213-216, 217, 218, 219.
—— strange conduct of, at Worcester, 214-216.
—— accused of treachery, 184, 442.
—— letter of, 184-185.

Levellers, 40, 133, 134, 203, 414, 417, 418, 419.
—— intrigue with Royalists, 133-134, 172, 417-418.
Leven, Earl of (Alexander Leslie), 173, 219.
Levinz, Captain Robert, 203.
Liége, supposed marriage of King at, 70.
Lilburne, John, 133, 417-418.
—— Colonel Robert, 209, 210, 218, 395, 399, 402, 408.
Limbry, Stephen, 255, 257, 258, 283.
—— wife of, 257, 258, 277.
Lindsay, Lord, 186.
Lisle, Sir George, 59.
Livingstone, James, 158-161, 170, 200.
Lloyd, Dr., 438.
Lochiel, Ewan Cameron of, 392.
London, 36, 40, 59, 169, 171, 208, 210, 212, 426.
—— City of, 40, 53, 171, 419.
—— Lord Mayor, 426.
—— Common Council of, 53.
Long, Sir Robert, 49, 58, 64, 79, 81, 124, 126, 137, 166, 196, 438, 469-470.
—— accused of treason, 454-457.
—— accuses Hyde, 470-474.
—— letter of, 457-458.
Long Marston, King's adventure at, 245.
Longueville, Duc de (Henri d'Orléans), 329, 335.
—— daughter of, 335.
Longueville, Duchesse de (Anne-Geneviève de Bourbon), 21, 32, 75, 329, 330.
Longueville, Mlle. de (Marie d'Orléans), 335-336.
Lorne, Archibald Campbell, Lord, 166, 178, 189, 191, 398, 402, 403.
—— letter of, 403.
Lorraine, Anne de, 303.
Lorraine, Charlotte de (Mlle. de Chevreuse), 332.
Lorraine, Charles IV., Duke of, 21, 38, 122, 141, 286, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 310, 312, 314, 315, 345, 349-351, 352, 353, 357, 361, 365, 367.
—— —— treats with Ireland, 300, 305-308, 310.
—— —— comes to aid Frondeurs, 349-352.
—— —— eccentricities of, 350-351.
—— —— treats with Mazarin, 351.
—— —— persuaded to retire by Charles II., 353.
—— —— returns to Paris, 357.
—— —— wild proposals of, 364.
—— —— anger of, with King, 364-365.
—— —— arrest of, 365.
—— —— character of, 300-301.
—— —— children of, 301-302.
—— —— daughter of, 303-304.
—— —— mistress of, 301.
—— —— wife of, 301.
—— —— brother of, 365.
—— —— army of, 301, 350, 351, 353, 357.
Lorraine, François de, 365.
Lorraine, Françoise de. *See* Vendôme.
Lorraine, Henri, Duc de, 301.
Lorraine, Marguerite de. *See* Orléans.
Lothian, Earl of (William Kerr), 134, 136, 140, 141, 155, 156, 157, 158, 164, 165, 178, 189, 191, 199.
—— as Commissioner at Breda, 134-143, 157-161.
Loudoun, Earl of (John Campbell), 149, 151, 189, 196, 202, 219, 397, 398.
Louis XIV. of France, 19, 20, 25, 26, 32, 104, 107, 109, 154, 330, 331, 333, 339, 340, 345-353, 357, 358, 360, 362, 430, 467, 491.
—— grants pension to Charles II., 430.
—— letter of, 351-352.
Louise, Princess Palatine, 69, 94.
Love, Christopher, 205.
Lovel, Robert, 466.
Low, Mr., 53.
Loyalists. *See* Royalists.
Lucas, Sir Charles, 59.
Ludlow, Colonel Edmund, 229, 300, 308.
Luis de Haro, Don, 287, 289, 290-291, 292, 293.

M

Macey, Captain, 258-260, 262.
Macgregors, The, 402.
Mackays, The, 146.
Mackeldney, 402.
Mackenzies, The, 146, 148.
Mackworth, Colonel, 210.
Macleod, Colonel, 397.
Macleods, The, 146, 410-411.
Macmahon, Emer (Bishop of Clogher), 296.
Madeley, King at, 228-229.
Madrid, embassy sent by King to, 100-101, 284, 286-293.
—— envoy sent from England to, 289-291.
Mainz, John Philip, Elector of, 363, 367, 368, 369, 372.
Malignants (*i.e.* Royalists), 81, 158, 173, 184, 209.
—— condemned by Scots, 81.
—— purged from Scottish army, 173, 176, 177.
—— banished from Court, 165-166, 188-189.
—— restored, 193-194, 199-200.
Mansel, Francis, assists King's escape, 271, 275-276, 278, 282.
Mar, Earl of, 163.
Marchin, Jean-Gaspard, Comte de, 329.
Marsh, Mr., 188.
Marshall, Earl (William Keith), 163.
Marsillac, François, Prince de (afterwards Duc de la Rochefoucauld, *q.v.*).
Martin, Edward, 223.
—— wife and sons of, 224.
Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, 162.

Mary Stuart, Princess of Orange, 46, 51, 69, 103, 104, 236, 315, 317, 319-320, 385, 390, 393-394, 466, 483, 494.
—— —— left a widow, 315.
—— —— difficult position of, 316, 319-320.
—— —— quarrel of, with Princess Dowager, 319-320, 363, 384.
—— —— messages of King to, 363.
—— —— forbidden by States to receive King, 383, 483, 494.
—— —— demands of Charles II. on, 384-385, 390, 393-394.
—— —— blamed by Royalists, 394.
—— —— character of, 385.
—— —— steward of, 316, 393-394.
—— —— son of, 316, 318.
—— —— letters to, 384, 385, 393.
Mason, ——, 480.
Massey, Major-General Edward, 172, 199, 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 218, 480.
—— letter of, 379.
Massonnett, Peter, 470, 472.
—— accuses Hyde of treason, 470.
—— attempts to bribe witness, 472.
Maurice, Prince Palatine of the Rhine, 55, 69, 93, 463.
—— lost at sea, 463.
May, Hugh, 217.
Mazarin, Jules, Cardinal, 12, 13, 19-22, 27-29, 33-36, 38, 48, 71, 74, 75, 86, 105, 118, 300, 308, 329-331, 343, 345-347, 349, 355, 357-362, 377, 378, 383, 388, 415, 435-436, 467, 485-487, 490.
—— opposes Charles's suit for Mademoiselle, 28-29, 33.
—— favours Charles's suit, 105.
—— sends Ambassador to England, 38.
—— welcomes Irish soldiers to France, 308.
—— exiled from France, 331.
—— triumphs over Fronde, 330, 357.
—— negotiates with England, 358-359, 362, 388.
—— negotiates with Dutch, 360, 377-378.
—— attempts to draw Irish from Spanish service, 361-362.
—— detains Stuarts in France, 360-361.
—— buys guns of the Swallow, 485-487.
—— assists Charles's departure from France, 490.
—— agreement of, with Charles, 490.
—— policy of, 21-22, 359-360, 377, 388.
—— power of, 19, 21, 27.
—— relations of, with Anne of Austria, 19.
—— unpopularity of, 21, 74, 346-347.
—— personality of, 19-20.
—— agents of, 359.
—— letter to, 312.
Melville, Sir George, 188.
Merchant Adventurers, ship of, 52-53.
Mercœur, Louis, Duc de, 20.
Mere, King at, 266-267.
Mersey, Scots force passage of, 208.
Mewes, Captain Peter, 411.
Meynell, Robert, mission of, to Rome, 284, 294-295.
—— letter of, 295-296.
Middleton, Sir Thomas (Royalist General), 42, 186, 191, 192, 199, 212, 213, 390, 391, 404-405.
—— takes arms for King in Highlands, 186, 192.
—— sends Northern Bond to Leslie, 192.
—— accepts indemnity, 192.
—— at Worcester, 213-216, 442.
—— taken prisoner, 217, 218, 390.
—— made commander-in-chief of Scottish Royalists, 392.
—— goes to Holland for supplies, 392-393.
—— aided by Princess of Orange, 394.
—— goes to Scotland, 394, 406.
—— difficulties of, 406-408.
—— deserted by Glencairn, 407.
—— price on head of, 408.
—— urges King to come, 409.
—— defeated at Dalnaspidal, 410.
—— flies to Skye, 410.
—— returns to continent, 411.
—— popularity of, 213, 392.
—— letters to, 398, 404-405, 407-408.
—— officer of, 398, 407.
Middleton, Sir Thomas (Governor of Chirk), 210.
Militia, English, supports Government, 205, 208.
Ministers, Scottish. *See* Scotland, Kirk of.
Monk, General George, 117, 202, 219, 382, 387-390, 391, 395, 402, 408, 410, 422, 423.
—— harsh conduct of, in Scotland, 219, 387-390, 391, 410.
—— sets price on heads of Royalists, 408, 422.
—— grants passes to Highland chiefs, 410.
Monkton Wylde, King at, 256-257.
Monroe, Sir George, 60, 192, 296, 394.
—— quarrel of, with Glencairn, 407.
Mons, King receives messengers from England at, 494.
Montagu, Walter, 322-323, 341, 351, 374.
Montbazon, Duchesse de, 350.
Montgomery, Colonel Robert, 176, 189, 190, 191, 193, 199, 212, 213.
—— pursues King to Clova, 189-190.
—— at Worcester, 212-213.
Montmorenci, Charlotte de (Princesse de Condé), 21.
Montpensier, Anne-Marie-Louise, Duchesse de (La Grande Mademoiselle), 6, 19, 28-30, 34, 78, 94, 109, 110-111, 337-339, 343, 350-351, 354, 356, 357.
—— Charles II.'s courtship of, 30-32, 104-108, 110-111, 335-342.
—— desires to be Empress, 32-34, 111.

Montpensier, Anne-Marie-Louise, Duchesse de (La Grande Mademoiselle), schemes to marry Archduke Leopold, 34-35.
—— resolves to marry Louis XIV., 339-340.
—— secures Orléans for Fronde, 346-347.
—— rescues magistrates from Hôtel de Ville, 355.
—— saves Condé's army, 355.
—— her opinion of Charles II., 6, 25, 108-109, 337-338, 340-341.
—— character of, 20, 29, 355.
—— sisters of, 110.
Montrose, James Graham, Marquis of, 5, 6, 41, 42, 55, 68, 83-95, 97-100, 101, 121-130, 132-139, 144-157, 163, 170, 173, 215, 298, 394.
—— proscribed by Covenanters, 55, 91, 134.
—— at the Hague, 83-94, 98-99.
—— refuses to trust Hamilton, 87-88.
—— Engagers' hatred of, 88-90, 91.
—— friendship of Palatines for, 86, 92, 93-95.
—— advises Charles II., 87, 98, 99.
—— commission of Charles II. to, 99-100.
—— seeks help in Northern Courts, 100, 122-123.
—— Argyle promises safety to, 139.
—— Charles sends excuses to, 144-145.
—— ruined by treaty of Breda, 144, 146.
—— lands in Scotland, 147.
—— defeated at Corbiesdale, 148.
—— betrayed by Assynt, 148.
—— capture and execution of, 95, 148-157.
—— courage and dignity of, 84-85, 148, 150, 152-154.
—— loyalty of, 5-6, 72, 85.
—— character of, 5, 84-85.
—— sons of, 148, 156, 164.
—— nephew of, 86, 394.
—— friends of, 42, 84, 97.
—— agent of, 128.
—— letters of, 87, 127-128.
—— letters to, 99, 121, 144-145.
Moray, Sir Robert, 405-406.
—— accused of treason, 405-406.
—— supposed letter of, 405.
Morgan, Colonel, 390, 410, 422.
—— defeats Middleton, 410.
Morley, Colonel Herbert, 274.
Morocco, embassy sent to, 285.
Morosini, Michele, 280.
Morton, Earl of (Robert Douglas), 147.
Morton, Countess of (Agnes Keith), 76, 453.
—— —— letter to, 141.
Moscow, embassy to, 285-286.
Moseley Hall, 230, 234, 236, 239, 262.
—— Wilmot sheltered at, 230, 235.
—— King at, 238-243.
Motteville. *See* De Motteville.
Munster, Irish forces in, defeated, 412.
Murray, Anne, assists James's escape, 44-45.
—— with King at Dunfermline, 174-175.
—— succours soldiers, 175.
—— affianced to Bampfylde, 174, 395.
—— poverty of, 175.
Murray, Lord, 186.
Murray, William, 83, 139, 145, 154.
—— —— *See* Dysart, Earl of.
Musgrave, Sir Philip, 42, 171, 188.
Muskerry, Lord (Charles Macarthy), 68, 180, 298.
—— letter to, 308.
Myvart, Colonel, 422.
Murray, Anne, 44-45, 174-175, 197, 395.

N

NAIRN, Captain, 190.
Nantes, Edict of, 360.
Napier, Archibald, Lord, 86, 394, 410.
Napier, Colonel, 361.
Nassau, Count William Frederick of (Stadtholder of Friesland and Groningen), 316, 376, 380, 384.
Nassau, Henriette of, 109.
Navigation Act, the, 375.
Nemours, Duc de, Charles-Amadée de Savoie, 330, 342, 343, 347.
Netherlands, United Provinces of the, Prince Charles welcomed in, 58.
—— Royalist sympathies of, 58, 73, 97, 319, 378, 383, 393.
—— forced into war with England, 375-376.
—— Mazarin proposes alliance with, 377-378.
—— factions in, 378, 382.
—— ports of opened to Charles II., 378-379.
—— at war with England, 376, 378, 382-383.
—— sufferings of in war, 382.
—— riots in, 382.
—— fleet of destroyed, 383.
—— seek peace, 382, 386.
—— treaty of, with England, 386, 421.
—— office of Stadtholder abolished in, 316, 386-387.
—— Stuarts excluded from, 386, 494.
—— ambassador of in Paris, 376-378, 384-386.
Netherlands, States-General of the United Provinces of, 38, 58, 63-64, 65, 70-71, 73, 79, 82-83, 97, 139, 315, 319, 323, 379, 383-384, 392-393.
—— —— receive Prince of Wales as guest, 58.
—— —— remonstrate against trial of Charles I., 71.
—— —— condole with Charles II., and recognise him as King, 73.
—— —— support Scottish commissioners, 82-83.

Netherlands, States-General of the United Provinces, receive envoys from England, 96, 319, 375.
—— —— request Charles II. to withdraw, 97.
—— —— lend money to Charles II., 103.
—— —— struggles of William II. with, 316.
—— —— refuse to elect William III. Stadtholder, 316.
—— —— relations of with England, 363, 375.
—— —— reject English terms, 375.
—— —— forced into war with England, 375-376.
—— —— distrust Charles II., 376, 377, 379.
—— —— reject Charles's overtures, 377, 380, 381.
—— —— Denmark intercedes for Charles with, 381.
—— —— desire peace with England, 96, 315, 316, 319, 376, 382, 386.
—— —— send aid to Scotland, 383, 393.
—— —— refuse to exclude William III., from Stadtholderate, 386.
—— —— treaty of, with England, 386, 421.
—— —— letter to, 379.
Newburgh, Lord (James Livingstone), 89, 187, 190, 193, 199, 391, 403.
—— wife of, 89.
Newcastle, Marquis of (William Cavendish), 136, 137, 171, 193, 405.
New England, prisoners sold to, 219.
New Guinea, attempt to sell prisoners to, 219.
Nicholas, Sir Edward, 49, 64, 73, 112, 124, 126, 127, 130, 137, 143, 196, 312-313, 318, 324, 330-331, 368, 370-371, 377, 378, 381, 419, 423, 437, 438, 439, 440, 460-461, 467-468, 478, 479, 480.
—— opposes alliance with Scots, 49, 124-127, 137.
—— disliked by Queen, 49, 312-313, 324, 326, 439.
—— refuses to come to Paris, sufferings of, 437, 440.
—— letters of, 73, 116, 203, 204, 320, 360, 370-371, 417, 437, 448, 449, 458, 481.
—— letters to, 101, 141, 185, 311, 313-315, 327, 343, 367, 370, 371, 384, 432-433, 435, 439, 448, 449, 451, 467, 478, 482.
—— son-in-law of, 131.
Nicole, Duchesse de Lorraine, 301.
Nieuport, Wilhelm (Dutch Ambassador to England), 382.
Northern Bond, the, 192.
Northumberland, Duke of (Algernon Percy), 43, 460.
Norton, Mrs., 246, 247, 249.
—— maid of, 247.
Norwich, Earl of (George Goring), 2, 37, 59, 363, 367, 458, 464, 370.
—— heads Kentish rising, 59.
—— sent on embassy to Brussels, 363-364.
Nuncio. *See* Pope, Nuncio of.

O

O'Brien, Mortagh, 413.
Ogilvie, George, 390.
—— wife of, 390.
Ogilvie, James, Lord, 186, 189.
Oldenburg, Duke of, 381.
O'Neil, Daniel, 206, 298, 308, 438, 484.
O'Neil, Henry, 296.
O'Neil, Hugh, 300.
O'Neil, Owen Roe, 67, 68, 288, 289, 296.
—— death of, 125, 296.
—— army of, 117, 296.
Orange, Amalia, Princess-Dowager of, 69, 93, 94, 317-320, 363, 369, 384.
—— quarrel of with Princess Mary, 319-320, 363, 384.
—— daughters of, 69.
Orange, Henriette de Nassau, Princess of, 109.
Orange, Henry Frederick, Prince of, 38.
Orange, Mary, Princess of. *See* Mary Stuart.
Orange, William II., Prince of (Stadtholder of the United Provinces of the Netherlands), 46, 51, 58, 61, 63, 69, 79, 81, 82, 88, 95, 96, 97, 100, 103-104, 138, 141, 157, 172, 284, 315-318, 320, 376, 385.
—— breaks news of Royalist disasters to Prince Charles, 61.
—— generosity of to Charles, 51, 58, 79, 103, 315.
—— advice of to Charles, 138, 141, 157.
—— difficulties of, 58, 79, 139, 315-316.
—— death of, 315, 317, 375, 376.
—— funeral of, 318.
—— son of, 316.
—— ships of, 118.
—— dogs and horses of, 108.
—— will of, 320.
—— letter to, 172.
Orange, William III., Prince of, 316, 360, 376, 382, 385.
—— birth of, 316.
—— christening of, 318.
—— States refuse to elect as Stadtholder, 316.
—— elected Stadtholder of Zealand, 383.
—— excluded from office, 386-387.
—— hofmeister of, 384, 385.
Orange, House of, 316, 386.
Orange, Party of, 315, 375, 376, 378, 382.
Orkneys, Montrose in, 147.
—— offered to Dutch, 377.
Orléans, City of, won for Fronde, by Mademoiselle, 346.

Orléans, Gaston, Duc d', 18, 20, 33, 35, 75, 104, 280, 329, 330, 331, 332, 335, 337, 340, 346, 347, 348, 350-357.
—— affection of for Henrietta, 18, 330.
—— averse to his daughter's marriage, 28-29, 105, 106, 340.
—— joins Fronde, 331, 346.
—— character of, 20, 29, 346, 355.
—— wife of (Marie de Bourbon), 28.
—— wife of (Marguerite de Lorraine), 20.
—— daughter of, 20, 25, 346, 355.
—— favourite of, 35, 105.
—— faction of, 27, 346, 349.
—— army of, 346.
Orléans, Duchesse d' (Marie de Bourbon), 28.
Orléans, Duchesse d' (Marguerite de Lorraine), 20, 106, 339, 350.
Ormonde, James Butler, Marquis of, 4-6, 11, 12, 66, 68, 73, 80, 99, 102, 121-126, 132, 134, 140, 144, 179-180, 193, 200, 294, 296, 298-299, 302, 304, 305, 306, 307, 318, 325-327, 356, 391, 400, 419, 447, 450-451, 456, 466, 468, 473, 481, 484, 489.
—— makes peace with Irish Confederates, 11, 67, 80.
—— difficulties of, 11-12, 67, 117.
—— defeated at Rathmines, 117.
—— peace of, repudiated by King, 141-142, 157-159.
—— ruined by Treaty of Breda, 144, 298.
—— deposed by Prelates, 298.
—— leaves Ireland, 299.
—— proposes to transport Ulster men to Scotland, 413.
—— investigates charges against Hyde, 471-472.
—— character of, 68, 325, 451.
—— poverty of, 326, 432, 434-437.
—— letters to, 13, 83, 116, 121, 298, 321, 401, 439.
—— letters of, 73, 125, 297, 306, 308, 325, 327, 471, 472.
Ormonde, Elizabeth Butler, Marchioness of, 118, 129, 297.
—— children of, 118.
Ostend, pirates of, 61.
O'Sullivan Beirne, 412-413.
Oudart, Nicholas, 166.
Overton, Colonel Robert, 420.

P

PAGE, Sir Richard, 405, 406.
—— wife of, 405.
Page, Lady, 405-406.
Palais Royal, ball at, 34.
—— English Court at, 358, 492.
Palatines, 93, 95.
Papacy. *See* Pope.
Paris, flight of French Court from, 75.
—— siege of, 76.
Paris, condition of, in Fronde, 76, 77, 347, 348, 354-357.
—— Condé summoned to, 347.
—— flight of English Court from, 356.
—— return of King and Cardinal to, 357.
Paris, Parliament of, 21, 36, 74, 75, 347, 357.
—— —— character and attitude of, 74.
—— —— forms committee of government, 75.
—— —— relieves Henrietta, 76.
—— —— demands release of Princes, 330.
—— —— declares Condé a traitor, 346.
—— —— sets price on Mazarin's head, 346.
—— —— refuses the Prince's alliance, 347, 354.
—— —— withdrawn to Pontoise, 357.
—— —— Presidents of, 355.
Parker, Mr., 280.
Parliament. *See* England, Scotland, Paris, Parliament of.
Pavillon, ——, 300.
Paylin, Thomas, 239.
Pembroke, Earl of (Philip Herbert), 171.
Pendeford Mill, 237.
Penderel, George, 223, 224, 226, 227.
Penderel, Humphrey, 223, 225, 226, 232, 236.
Penderel, Joan, 231, 241.
Penderel, John, 223, 224, 234, 235, 236, 240, 243.
—— aids Wilmot to escape, 234-235.
—— finds shelter for King at Moseley, 236.
Penderel, Nan, 227.
Penderel, Richard, 223-227, 230, 232, 237.
—— disguises King, 224.
—— takes King to his house, 227.
—— guides King to Madeley, 230.
—— guides King to Boscobel, 230.
Penderel, William, 223-226, 231, 237, 241.
—— shelters King at Boscobel, 231-234.
—— steals sheep for King, 233.
Penderel, Mrs., 227.
Penderels, 210, 282.
—— rewards to, 237, 282.
Penrith, King proclaimed at, 206.
Percy, Henry, Lord, 24, 54, 55, 63, 92, 93, 105, 124, 378, 385, 417, 459-460, 473, 492.
—— in Scottish interest, 55, 81, 82, 126, 135.
—— general distrust of, 459-460, 467-468.
—— made Lord Chamberlain, 467.
—— intrigues against Hyde, 468.
—— brother of, 460.
—— sister of, 460.
Persia, embassy to, 285.
Perth, 164, 174, 179, 185, 187, 202.
—— taken by Cromwell, 201.
Peters, Henry, 250, 253, 256, 258, 261, 263, 264, 266, 267.
—— engages inn for King, 255.

Petre, Mr., 244-245.
—— Mrs., 244-245.
Phelips, Edward, 265.
Phelips, Colonel Robert, 263-265, 266, 267, 271, 273, 274, 282, 422.
—— engages ship for King, 264-265.
—— conducts King to Heale, 266-267, 268.
——brings King to Hambledon, 272.
——arrested, 419.
Philip IV., King of Spain, 286, 288, 290, 300.
—— sympathises with Charles II., 288, 292-293.
—— makes peace with England, 292-293.
—— sister of, 289.
—— favourite of, 287.
Philip, Prince Palatine of the Rhine, 69.
Philips, Christopher, 266.
Philips, Father, 322.
Pignoranda, Conde de, 104, 286.
Pitscottie, Colonel, 213.
Plunckett, Nicholas, 306, 307, 308.
—— makes unauthorised treaty with Lorraine, 307.
—— pardoned by King, 308.
Poissy, Convent of St. Dominique at, 110.
Poland, 284, 285.
—— embassy to, 285.
—— Ambassador of at Diet, 372.
Poland, Jean Casimir, King of, 122, 285.
Poland, Queen of (Marie de Gonzague), 122, 285.
Pope (Innocent X.), 38, 67, 288, 300, 301, 302, 307, 374-375, 468.
—— address of Charles II. to, 173.
—— embassy to, 294-295.
—— demands Charles's Conversion, 374.
—— De Retz proposes appeal to, 445-446.
Pope, Nuncio of, in Ireland, 11, 12, 67, 68, 117, 294-295.
—— at Madrid, 286, 288, 291, 295.
—— at Ratisbon, 367.
Pope (Julius II.), 390.
Pope, John, 246-248, 249, 253.
—— recognises King, 247.
—— seeks ship for King, 248.
Porter, Endymion, 23.
Porter, Mr., 261.
Portugal, 82, 97, 292.
—— makes treaty with England, 388.
—— Princes of, 318.
—— Ambassador of, 97.
Powick Bridge, 211, 212.
Presbyterians (English), 38, 39, 41, 125, 133, 138, 139, 143, 169, 171-173, 203, 204, 207, 209, 379, 414, 419, 421, 432, 440-443, 468, 482.
—— ready to join King, 125, 133, 419.
—— alienated from King, 173, 207, 209.
—— discontented with English Government, 169, 203, 414.
—— supply King with money, 171, 432.
Presbyterians, Scottish. *See* Covenanters and Scotland.
Preston, Hamilton defeated at, 60.
Preston, Sir John, 239.
Preston, General Thomas (Viscount Tara), 67, 68, 297.
Princes of Empire. *See* Empire.
Privy Council. *See* Council.
Progers, Edward, 128, 189, 190, 196.
Progers, Henry, concerned in Ascham's murder, 290.
Protectorate, established in England, 419.
—— proclaimed in Scotland, 408.
Puritans, 93, 414, 482.

Q

QUAKERS, released by Charles II., 282.
Queen of England. *See* Henrietta Maria.
Queen-Regent of France. *See* Anne of Austria.

R

RADCLIFFE, Sir George, 169, 311-314, 325, 458.
—— instigates James's flight to Brussels, 312.
Rainsborough, Admiral Thomas, 43, 46.
Rathmines, Ormonde defeated at, 117, 121.
Ratisbon, Diet at, 366, 372-373.
—— embassy to, 367-374.
Regicides, excepted from pardon, 206, 243.
Remonstrance, The (of the Covenanters), 192, 193.
Remonstrants, 193.
Republicans, Dutch, 378, 382.
See Netherlands.
Reresby, Sir John, 188.
Resolution, The (of the Scottish Committee of Estates), 193.
Resolutioners adhere to King, 193, 398.
Restoration, The, 237, 243, 252, 267, 474.
Retz, Cardinal de (Jean-François-Paul de Gondi, Coadjutor-Archbishop of Paris), 75, 76, 85, 154, 328, 330-335, 347, 350, 357, 445-446.
—— his opinion of Montrose, 85.
—— his opinion of Beaufort, 75.
—— part of in Fronde, 75, 330-334, 347.
—— sympathy of, for Stuarts, 76, 335, 445.
—— arrest of, 357.
—— character of, 76.
Reymes, Colonel Bullen, 262-263.
Reynolds, Francis, 239, 242, 243.
Rhine, Charles Louis, Elector Palatine of the, 363, 369, 371, 373.
—— letter to, 368.
Richelieu, Cardinal (Armand Jean Duplessis), 19.

Richmond, James Stuart, Duke of, 7, 171, 204.
—— brother of, 89.
Rinuccini, Giovanni-Battista (Archbishop of Fermo, Papal Nuncio in Ireland), 11, 67, 294, 295.
—— denounces treaty of Confederates with Ormonde, 11, 117.
—— rejects alliance of Inchiquin, 68.
Rivière, Abbé de la. *See* De la Rivière.
Rochefort, Hugh, 302, 307.
Rochefoucauld. *See* La Rochefoucauld.
Rochester, Henry Wilmot, Earl of. *See* Wilmot.
Rocroi, victory of Condé at, 21.
Roger, Abraham, 257.
Rogers, Henry, 250, 253.
Rokeby, King proclaimed at, 206.
Roman Catholics, 209, 294, 442, 465.
—— penal laws against, 134, 142, 237.
—— concessions offered to, 173, 286.
—— petition of, against Hyde, 468-469.
Romans, King of (Ferdinand IV.), 366, 371, 372.
Rome, 308.
—— negotiations of King with, 173, 284, 294-295, 374-375.
Rooksby, Colonel, 326, 327.
Roscarrock, Colonel Edward, 222, 223.
Ross, Thomas, 165.
Rouen, Royalists at, 23, 49.
—— King at, 279-280.
Roxburgh, Earl of (Robert Kerr), 200.
Royalism, decay of, 142, 173, 205-206, 413.
—— revival of, 40, 413, 415, 418-421.
Royalists in England, 7, 40, 41, 42, 59, 132, 133, 171-173, 202, 204, 205, 208, 210, 212, 213, 214, 217, 218, 219, 240, 264, 413, 421, 428, 437, 494, 495.
—— rising of, 40-42, 43, 59.
—— failure of, 59, 221.
—— send money to King, 120, 430-432, 489.
—— preparations of, 132, 171-172, 203.
—— repressive measures against, 169, 205.
—— betrayed to Government, 203-204.
—— alienated from King, 142, 173, 205-206, 413.
—— defeated at Wigan, 210.
—— Cromwell attempts to conciliate, 416.
—— plots of, 419-421, 425-427, 428.
—— council of, 420.
—— condition of, 431-432.
—— envoys sent to King by, 489, 464.
Royalists in exile, 4, 10, 23, 24, 40, 60, 79, 97, 101, 124, 135, 142, 165, 284, 316, 334, 360, 381, 387, 394, 400, 422-423, 430, 431, 477-480, 482.
—— proscribed by Scots, 55, 165, 166.
—— indignation of with Scots, 124, 135, 142.
Royalists at Hague, 79, 96, 97.
—— in Spain, 290, 292.
—— in France, 23, 24, 117, 321-323, 429, 438, 440-443.
—— distrust Queen, 102-103, 311-312, 321, 328, 330-331.
—— loyalty of, 2, 4.
—— poverty of, 2, 28, 432-437.
—— dissensions of, 4, 5, 321, 414, 429, 437-438, 440-443.
Royalists in Scotland, 41, 145, 157, 194, 198, 219, 390, 391, 402, 406.
—— terms offered to, 145.
—— conspire in Highlands, 186-189, 191-192.
—— association of, in Highlands, 392.
—— Middleton made general of, 392.
—— activity of, 394-395, 397, 399-400, 402.
—— betrayed by Bampfylde, 396-397.
—— forced to the hills, 397.
—— factions of, 398-399, 402, 403-404, 407-408.
—— joined by Middleton, 407.
—— defeated by Monk, 410.
—— submission of, 410.
—— letter of, 396.
Rueil, Peace of, 78, 328.
Rupert, Prince Palatine of the Rhine, 4, 11, 24, 31, 34, 48, 50, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 64, 65, 69, 80, 82, 92, 93, 103, 113, 116, 117, 170, 221, 289, 304, 311, 366, 379, 381, 419, 430, 460, 463, 464, 465, 469, 473, 476, 488, 491, 492.
—— proscribed by Scots, 55.
—— takes charge of fleet, 66.
—— off Irish coast, 66, 80, 117.
—— off Spanish coast, 292.
—— friendship of with Montrose, 86.
—— implicated in Henshaw's Plot, 424-425.
—— return of to France, 462-463.
—— alliance of with Queen, 463-464, 488.
—— supports Hyde, 473, 476.
—— attempts to sell guns, 485.
—— desires payment of debts, 486, 487.
—— quarrels with King, 486-488, 495.
—— desired to go to Scotland, 488.
—— anger of Charles with, 491.
—— goes to Germany, 491-492.
—— influence of, with Charles II., 50, 55, 463.
—— illness of, 464.
—— party of, 4, 92, 116, 464.
—— brother of, 363.
—— page of, 462.
—— friends of, 113, 311, 464, 488.
—— letter of, 487.
—— letters to, 94, 485.
—— declaration of, 73.
Ruthven, men of, 402.
Ruthven Castle, 402.

S

St. Amand, Abbey of, 77.
St. Andra, church of, 290.
St. Antoine, battle of, 355.
—— Jesuits of, 467.
St. Clair, Lord, 83, 163, 186.
St. Fagan's, Royalists defeated at, 59.
St. Germains, 16, 104, 111, 117, 118, 433.
St. John, Oliver, 319, 375.
St. Malo, 15, 118.
St. Neot's, 59.
St. Paul, Vicomte de, 188.
Salisbury, Wilmot at, 263-264.
—— Royalist inn at, 264.
Sandbourne, Mr., 279.
Sandown Castle, 46, 51, 52.
Saujeon, M. de, 34, 35.
Schomberg, Count Frederick, 363.
Scone, coronation at, 194.
Scotland, 38, 39, 61, 82, 117, 145, 154, 157, 170, 216, 222, 338.
—— parties in, 41, 61, 81, 83, 96, 134, 192-194, 200, 398-399.
—— Charles I. treats with, 39, 40.
—— Prince Charles invited to, 41, 54, 55.
—— Charles II. proclaimed in, 80.
—— Montrose's invasion of, 99, 123, 127-128, 145-148.
—— treaty of Charles II. with, 126, 134-144, 157-161.
—— decay of Royalism in, 146.
—— reception of King in, 162, 163.
—— indifference of King to, 163, 170, 338.
—— address of Cromwell to, 170.
—— south of, subjugated by Cromwell, 183, 200.
—— conquest of, by English, 219, 389, 495.
—— King seeks help for, 381, 393.
—— Royalist rising in, 383, 389-392, 394-395, 397-400, 402-404, 406-411.
—— scheme to send James and Rupert to, 488.
Scotland, Army of, 7, 38, 176, 184, 185, 187, 192, 201, 205, 209.
—— —— holds Charles I. prisoner, 7.
—— —— offers terms to Charles I., 39
—— —— surrenders Charles I. to England and retreats, 39.
—— —— defeat of at Preston, 60.
—— —— new levies for, 173.
—— —— skirmish of with Cromwell, 176.
—— —— 'purged' of Royalists, 173, 176-177.
—— —— visit of King to, 176.
—— —— threatens to renounce King, 178, 180, 181.
—— —— defeated by Cromwell at Dunbar, 182-183.
—— —— fresh levies of King for, 198-200.
Scotland, Army of, march of to England, 202, 206-211.
—— —— at Worcester, 212-215, 240, 244, 334, 441-442.
—— —— flight of, 215-217, 222.
—— —— destruction of, 219, 221, 222.
Scotland, Kirk of, 136, 138, 139, 150, 153, 161, 162, 165, 166, 176, 177, 180, 182, 185, 186.
—— —— tyranny of, 41.
—— —— power of, 134, 166, 398.
—— —— excommunicates Montrose, 150-153.
—— —— harasses King, 167.
—— —— purges army, 176.
—— —— repudiates King, 178, 180.
—— —— forces Leslie to fight, 181-182.
—— —— power of broken, 182, 185, 399.
—— —— refuses to restore Engagers, 186.
—— —— admits 'Malignants' to penance, 194.
—— —— sends letter to Presbytery of Lancashire, 209.
—— —— ministers of, 150, 153, 167-168, 176, 181-182, 184, 194, 195, 209, 410.
Scotland, the General Assembly of the Kirk of, 61, 81, 91, 134, 136, 160, 176, 177, 178.
—— —— Commissioners of, at Hague, 91-93, 99.
—— —— Commissioners of, at Breda, 134, 137-138, 155-156.
—— —— Commissioners of, on voyage from Holland, 158-160.
—— —— remorse of Commissioners of, 160-161.
—— —— forces King to sign declaration, 177-179.
—— —— proposes to treat with Cromwell, 178, 180.
—— —— publishes *Causes of Defeat*, 182, 186.
—— —— rejects motion to restore Engagers, 186.
—— —— refuses 'Resolution,' 193.
—— —— Parliament acts without, 193.
—— —— Commissioners of, in army, 209.
—— —— letter of King to, 398.
Scotland, Parliament of (Committee of Estates), 41, 43, 61, 67, 81, 98, 99, 126, 127, 138, 139, 140, 157, 161, 163, 164, 166, 177, 178, 187, 188, 189, 199, 219.
—— —— sends Commissioners to King at Hague, 91, 93-95.
—— —— terms of, rejected by King, 99.
—— —— makes new overtures to King, 123, 125.
—— —— reply of King to, 127.
—— —— Commissioners of, at Breda, 134, 135, 137, 138, 140-145.
—— —— treaty of King with, 139-142.

Scotland, Parliament of (Committee of Estates), sentences Montrose to death, 151-152.
—— —— letter of King to, 154-155, 185.
—— —— wrings fresh concessions from King, 157-161.
—— —— banishes English from court, 165, 189.
—— —— forces King to leave army, 174.
—— —— forces King to sign Declaration, 177-178.
—— —— orders Leslie to fight, 182.
—— —— refuses to restore Engagers, 186.
—— —— alarmed by King's flight, 189, 191.
—— —— changes attitude towards King, 191-192, 196.
—— —— gives indemnity to Royalists, 192.
—— —— condemns 'Remonstrance,' 193.
—— —— acts without Kirk, 193.
—— —— restores 'Malignants,' 193, 194.
Scots, 7, 38, 39, 40, 41, 54, 55, 60, 82, 83, 117, 126, 137, 138, 143, 144, 155, 162, 163, 170-172, 173, 176, 179, 180, 181-183, 202, 204, 205, 206, 211, 214, 218, 240, 244, 295, 334, 391, 441-442, 445.
Scott, Mr., 280.
Seaforth, Earl of (George Mackenzie), 146, 192, 193, 398, 408.
—— letter of, 396.
Sealed Knot, the, 420-422, 425, 428.
—— authorised by King, 420.
—— instructions to, 421.
—— plots of, 421-422, 428.
Severn, the, 210, 211, 212, 213.
—— King attempts to cross, 227, 229.
Seymour, Henry, 121, 125, 126, 165, 174, 179, 186, 190, 196, 318, 323, 324, 422, 432, 489.
—— mission of, to England, 432.
—— arrest of, 432, 489.
Shawe, Captain, 397.
Sherborne, Wilmot at, 263.
—— troops at, 265.
Shoreham, boat secured for King at, 272.
—— King sails from, 277-278.
Shrewsbury, Earl of, 210.
Shrewsbury, governor of, 210.
Sidney, Colonel Robert, 70,
Smith, Sir James (Scottish Commissioner at Breda), 134, 136, 158.
Sophie, Princess Palatine of the Rhine, 69, 94, 95, 109.
—— admiration of King for, 94-95.
—— letter of, 94.
Southall ——, 242.
Southampton, search for ship at, 264-265.
Southampton, Earl of (Thomas Wriothesley), 7.
Southesk, Earl of, 164.
Spain, 21, 24, 67, 73, 75, 104, 284, 286, 289, 293, 345, 349, 358-360, 361, 366, 493, 494.
—— allies with Fondeurs, 75, 345, 349, 357.
—— embassy to, 100, 112, 286-293.
—— English envoy in, 289-290.
—— sympathy of with Charles II., 75, 286-288, 292-293.
—— relations of with England, 289, 293, 288.
—— Irish soldiers desert from, 361-362, 366.
—— condition of, 104, 284.
—— Ambassador of, 371, 372, 359.
Spain, King of. *See* Philip IV.
Spang, William (Minister of Campvere), 95.
Sparkes, William, 291.
—— letter of, 291.
Staffordshire, Militia of, 208.
Stamford, Countess of (Anne Cecil), 218.
Stanhope, Katharine, Lady (wife of Herr van Heenvliet), 317.
—— letter to, 317.
Start, The, 186-191, 193.
Staunton, ——, 233.
Stewart, Dr. Richard, 26, 52-53, 100, 311, 312, 318, 441, 443.
—— counsels James's flight from Paris, 312.
—— with James at Brussels, 312-313.
—— letter of, 313-314.
Stirling, 175, 179, 185, 200, 201, 202.
—— captured by Monk, 219.
Stonehenge, King at, 268.
Strachan, Colonel Archibald, 148, 186, 192, 193, 194.
Strachan, Major John, 404, 409.
Strafford, Earl of (Thomas Wentworth), 17, 40, 74.
Strangeways, Giles, 254.
Stratford, adventure of King at, 245.
Strickland, Walter, 73, 319, 375.
Stuarts, 40, 111, 119, 339, 358.
—— sins of, 185, 194, 195.
—— loyalty to, 221.
—— detained in France, 360-361.
—— relations of, with Spain, 366.
—— excluded from Netherlands, 386.
Supreme Council of the Confederate Catholics, 67.
Swallow, The, 58, 463.
—— guns of, 484-486.
Swan, Robert, 246, 250, 253, 263, 268, 269, 270, 272, 273, 274.
Sweden, treaty of, with England, 387.
Sweden, Charles Gustavus of, 388.
Sweden, Queen of. *See* Christina.
Swordsmen, The, 4, 459, 464.
Symons, Thomas, 273, 274, 282.
Symons, Mrs., 272, 273.
Synott, Colonel Oliver, 302, 307.

T

TAAFE, Theobald, Viscount, 3, 68, 302-305, 306, 307, 325, 335, 374, 465.
—— treats with Lorraine, 303-305.
—— defends Hyde, 472.
Talbot, Francis Lord, 211, 217, 222.
Tattersal, Nicholas, 271, 275-276, 278, 279, 282.
—— recognises King, 276.
—— takes King to France, 278-279.
—— wife of, 277, 278.
—— ship of, 276, 282.
—— crew of, 278, 279.
Tavannes, The, 330.
Taylor, John, 367-368, 370, 371.
—— letter to, 495.
Teme, The, passage over, 211, 212, 213.
Terheiden, King embarks at, 158.
Teviotdale, gentry of, 177.
Thames, The, Royalist fleet in, 52.
Thurloe, John (Secretary of State), spies of, 426, 441, 465, 467, 480.
—— letters to, 361, 424.
Thynne, Lady Isabella, 129.
Titus, Captain Silas, 125, 196, 197.
Tomes, John, 245.
Toulon, debts contracted for fleet at, 463, 484, 487.
Trent, 248, 254.
—— King at, 251, 254-256, 263, 265-266.
Tuam, Dean of (Dr. King), 179, 180, 298, 299.
Tudors, 40, 221.
Turenne, Vicomte de (Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne), 21, 75, 329, 346-348, 352-353, 357, 362, 454, 493.
—— joins Fronde, 329.
—— joins King, 346.
—— forces Lorraine to retreat, 351-353.
—— James serves under, 348, 354.
Turner, Sir James, 194.
—— escape of, after Worcester, 217.

U

ULEFELDT, Cornelius, Count, 99.
Ulster, forces of, 117.
—— Massacre in, 121.
United Provinces. *See* Netherlands.
Utrecht, Province of, 386.

V

VAN TROMP, Marten (Dutch Admiral), 376, 378, 380, 383.
—— defeat and death of, 383.
Vendôme, César, Duc de, 20, 104.
—— wife of, 20.
—— sons of, 20.
Vendôme, Françoise de Lorraine, Duchesse de, 20, 78.
Vendôme, House of, 20, 329.
Vienna, King desires invitation to, 363.
Vieuville, Marquis de, 315.
Villeneuve, Marquis de, 188.
Villiers, Edward, 422.
Villiers, Francis, 59, 187.
Virginia, prisoners sold as slaves to, 60.
Von Karpfen, Count, 123, 132, 138, 171.
Vowel, Peter, involved in Henshaw's plot, 426-427.

W

WADE, Margaret, 255, 259.
Waldeck, Count, 392.
Waldemar of Denmark, Count, 122, 132, 138.
Wales, 208, 210, 211.
—— Royalist rising in, 59.
Walker, Sir Edward, 167, 188, 458-459.
Walker, Father, 223, 235.
Wallace, William, 399.
Walmer Castle, 46, 51.
Walsingham, Francis, 469.
Walter, Lucy (Mrs. Barlow), mistress of Charles II., 70, 95.
—— son of, 70.
Warrington, skirmish at, 208.
—— Council held by Derby at, 209.
Warwick, Earl of (Robert Rich), commands Parliamentary fleet, 52-58, 64-65.
Watson, —— (Chaplain of Lord Hopton), letters of, 142, 417, 422, 477, 478-479,
Webster, John, 390.
Weir, Major, 150.
Wemyss, Earl of, 176.
Wentworth, Thomas, Lord, 13, 16, 24, 54, 126, 140, 158, 188, 197, 459, 480.
—— of Scottish faction, 126.
—— embassy of, to Denmark, 381, 392.
—— letter of, 459.
—— letters to, 436, 489.
—— servant of, 268.
Wesley, —— (minister at Charmouth), 259.
Westphalia, peace of, 284.
Wexford, massacre at, 121, 219.
Whiteladies, 223, 232, 234, 235, 241.
—— King at, 223-224, 230.
Whitelocke, Bulstrode, 415.
Whitford, Colonel Walter, 97.
Whitgreave, John, 235, 236, 240, 241-243, 282.
—— shelters Wilmot, 235.
—— shelters King, 237-243.
—— mother of, 239.
—— nephews of, 239.
Whitgreave, Mrs., 239, 240, 243.
Wiatt, Sir Dudley, 9.
Widdrington. *See* Withrington.
Wigan, defeat of Derby at, 210, 213, 222.
Wight, Isle of, 52.
—— treaty at, 41.

William of Orange. *See* Orange.
Willoughby of Parham, Francis, Lord, 47, 48, 50, 52, 55, 65, 171, 420.
Wilmot, Henry, Lord (later Earl of Rochester), 13, 16, 24, 54, 55, 140, 158, 165, 166, 188, 197, 216, 222, 224, 225, 230, 243, 248, 256, 261, 349, 364, 369, 391, 450, 455, 458, 460, 480, 484.
—— betrays King's schemes, 188.
—— aided by John Penderel, 234.
—— consideration of, for King, 234-235, 238, 239.
—— at Moseley, 235, 238.
—— at Bentley, 235-236, 240.
—— refuses to be disguised, 246, 250.
—— sent to Trent by King, 248-249, 250.
—— with King at Charmouth, 256-258.
—— narrow escape of, 259.
—— King refuses to desert, 260.
—— resemblance of, to Colonel Reymes, 262.
—— goes to Salisbury, 263-264.
—— seeks Colonel Gounter's aid for King, 268-272.
—— joins King at Warnford, 272-274.
—— goes with King to Brighton, 274-278.
—— returns to France, 278-280.
—— embassy of, to Diet, 366, 367-368, 369, 370-374.
—— created Earl of Rochester, 450.
—— affection of King for, 451.
—— inspires Wogan's accusation of Long, 456-457.
—— character of, 370-371.
—— letters to, 365, 375, 420, 436, 464, 465, 466, 484, 490.
—— secretary of, 368-373.
Winram of Libberton, George, 91, 123-124, 125, 126-128, 134, 136, 158.
—— sent to King in Jersey, 123-124.
—— Commissioner at Breda, 134.
—— letter of, 123.
Winter, Sir John, 248.
Wiseman, John, 424, 427.
Wishart, Dr. George (Bishop of Edinburgh), 88, 89, 153.
Witherington, William, Lord, 16, 54, 210.
Withers, Eleanore, 250.
Wogan, Colonel Edward, 215, 400, 456.
—— adventure of, 400-401.
—— accuses Long of treason, 455-457.
—— death of, 402.
—— letters of, 401, 457.
Wolfe, Mr. Francis, 228, 282.
—— shelters King, 229-230.
—— son of, 229.
Wolfe, Mrs., 229.
Wood, Sir Henry, 419, 430.
Wood, James, 91, 158.
Wood, —— (agent of Montrose), 130.
Worcester, King at, 210-212, 227.
—— battle of, 213-216, 219, 234, 240, 242, 247, 250, 327, 440-441.
—— flight from, 216-218, 241, 255.
—— Mayor of, 210, 211, 218.
Wotton, adventure of King at, 245.
Wright, Sir Benjamin, 286, 287.
Wurtemburg, Duke of, 370.
Wyndham, Anne (wife of Francis Wyndham), 248, 250, 253, 265.
Wyndham, Colonel Edmund, 114-116, 249, 471-472.
—— King desires to make Secretary of State, 114-116, 249.
—— evidence of, against Hyde, 471-472.
Wyndham, Colonel Francis, 248, 249, 250, 253, 256, 262, 263, 264, 266, 282, 283.
—— receives King at Trent, 251.
—— searches for ship for King, 254-255.
—— accused of hiding Royalists, 256.
—— with King at Charmouth, 256-258.
—— ,, ,, Bridport, 260-261.
—— ,, ,, Broadwindsor, 261-262.
—— wife of, 248, 250, 253, 265.
—— brother of, 249.
—— father of, 251.
—— mother of, 250, 251.
—— uncle of, 262.
Wyndham, Sir Hugh, 262.
—— daughter of, 262.
Wyndham, Sir Thomas, his charge to his sons, 251.
Wyndham, Mr., 188, 189.
Wyndham, Elizabeth, Lady, 250, 251, 266.
Wyndham, Christabella, nurse of Charles II., 113, 115.
—— husband of, 114-116.

Y

YATES, Elizabeth, 226, 237.
Yates, Francis, 223, 224, 227, 228, 236, 237.

Z

ZEALAND, trade of, 375.
Zealand, States of, send message to Charles II., 380.
—— elect William III. of Orange Stadtholder, 383.
—— oppose peace with England, 383, 386.

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to His Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press

DA446.S42
The king in exile
3 0629 0079711 4

DA
446
S42